

Fishing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 6217. A bill for the relief of Angela J. Gingerich and Major Robert E. Bent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lawrence B. Cooper, Dennison, Ill., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

100. Also, petition of Ivan Struk, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the status of the Ukraine; to the Committee on International Relations.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6096

By Mr. STARK:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000".

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000".

Page 1, line 5, strike the entire of section 2, and make changes accordingly in the rest of the bill.

Page 1, line 7, strike ", notwithstanding any other provision of law,".

Page 2, line 2, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof ", to be expended within 40 days of enactment of this bill."

Page 2, line 2, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof ", to be expended within 30 days of enactment of this bill."

Page 2, line 2, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof ", to be expended within 15 days of enactment of this bill."

Page 2, line 5, add after "93-126," "or" and on lines 6-7 strike "or any other comparable provision of law".

Page 2, line 21, strike the semi-colon and the "and" and insert in lieu thereof a period. Then strike Section 4(d), lines 22-25 (on page 2) and lines 1-5 on page 3.

Page 2, line 23, strike the colon and insert in lieu thereof ", not to exceed 150,000:"

Page 2, line 23, strike the colon and insert in lieu thereof ", not to exceed 100,000:"

Page 2, line 23, strike the colon and insert in lieu thereof ", not to exceed 50,000:"

Page 3, line 17, add the following new Sec. 8. "None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act shall be used to provide military assistance to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Page 2, line 12, strike "if possible," and strike the entire of line 13 and line 14 through and including "force,".

Page 3, line 5, after the period, add "Provided further, That such forces shall not exceed in number 10,000."

Page 3, line 5, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a semi-colon, and add: "Provided further, That such forces shall not exceed in number 20,000."

Page 2, lines 19-21, strike subsection (c).

Page 3, line 17, add the following new Sec. 8. "None of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act shall be used to provide assistance of any kind to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Page 1, line 3, after "the" strike "Vietnam Humanitarian Assistance and Evacuation Act of 1975" and insert in lieu thereof "The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of 1975".

By Mr. WHALEN:

Delete section 3 of the bill H.R. 6096 (page 2, lines 3 through 9, inclusive).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR HOLLINGS RECEIVES AN AWARD FROM NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION: REVIEWS ENERGY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in this time of uncertainty in our country it becomes increasingly important to maintain a sense of perspective with regard to our national priorities. The need to provide long-term, stable energy supplies and the need to end the economic recession result in great pressures to shunt aside some of our other goals.

If we are to successfully meet the multiple challenges of the 1970's our country needs leadership from men with the ability to rationally examine all sides of a situation and provide balanced answers to a series of very perplexing questions. One such citizen is our able colleague from South Carolina, Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS. He is a champion of environmental protection, but he also is aware that the United States must continue to develop if it is to prosper.

During the 93d Congress it was my privilege to be associated with Senator HOLLINGS in development of the Deep-water Port Act, a measure which gives proper weight to the needs of both energy supply and the environment. As chairman of the National Ocean Policy Study he is leading a comprehensive examination that will provide us with a firm foundation on which to base important decisions about the use of the seas.

Mr. President, Senator HOLLINGS' work recently was recognized by the National Wildlife Foundation which designated him as its 1974 Legislator of the Year.

The award was presented at the foundation's 39th annual conference in Pittsburgh, Pa. At that time Senator HOLLINGS delivered a thoughtful and perceptive address, "Estuaries and Energy Development—Can We Have Both?"

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTUARIES AND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT—CAN WE HAVE BOTH?

(By Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS)

It is indeed an honor to be asked to address a group that has for years staunchly fought to protect and preserve our natural heritage. You folks have a long and consistent record of achievement that has had an effect on everything from our fine national parks system to the Clean Air Act and Water Pollution Control Act of recent years. You're involved; you are always on top of the issues and legislation of the day; and when your representatives come to testify on Capitol Hill, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives alike, listen with respect. Your approach has always been one of reason, and I consider it a pleasure to be associated with your activities here today.

If I had come before this groups three years ago, when my Senate colleagues and I were working to get the Coastal Zone Management Act passed, energy development in the coastal zone would have perhaps been among the last issues I would have discussed. The energy picture was rosy in this country at that time. We were still the proverbial land of milk and honey, of low utility bills and cheap gasoline. We could talk freely of preserving and protecting our environment in those days without fear of being charged with damaging the economy. Offshore development meant the Gulf of Mexico or Santa Barbara and supertankers were as unimportant to us as our dilapidated railroad system. And our main problem with protecting wetlands and estuaries along the coast was the press of heavy industry, tourism and second home development. We had no energy policy, we had no coastal zone

policy and we felt that our economic policies were so resilient that we could not possibly backslide into another depression.

But this country is a very different place today than it was then. The energy situation has changed, our economy has changed, and our politics have changed. Let it never be said that this country can't adjust to change—with Watergate, the Arab oil embargo, a 11 percent inflation rate, \$200 gas bills and 8.5 percent unemployment and still holding together—believe me, we can adjust to anything.

Anyway, I didn't come here to describe a situation that you, as American citizens, know only too well. Primarily, I have one message today: we can have the energy development we need in the coastal zone, and we can maintain productive estuaries and wetlands. These do not have to be mutually exclusive activities. Two seemingly incompatible systems—one manmade, the other natural—can, and must, exist side-by-side. But it cannot be done without proper information planning and regulation at all levels of government.

Development has been the touchstone to progress in the coastal zone for years. Until recently, State and local governments have sworn by it. Florida couldn't get enough tourism, motels, hotels; New Jersey couldn't get enough industry; and the Federal government couldn't fund enough highways to move people into the area. If the beaches were crowded and smokestacks were smoking, there was money in everyone's pocket and life was one big Disney World. Planning, in most cases, consisted of little more than local zoning and no one was taking a long look down the road to see where all of this was leading us.

And, of course, there was little emphasis on protecting wetlands and estuaries. They were in the way of development, and the motto of the day—perhaps coined by the Corps of Engineers—became "the only good wetland is a drained wetland." Get the water and the weeds out of the way, we said, and then we can build something on it!

The National Wildlife Federation knew about the economic and environmental significance of the wetlands and the academic community knew. You knew this about

their productivity and their role in the food chain. But the message failed to reach the planners on the local level, the Corps of Engineers, and the Administration. Wetland preservation policies became the dregs of local, State, and Federal development policies.

Had we followed the recommendations of the Stratton Commission in the '60's we would have developed a coastal zone management strategy long before 1972. But the Stratton Commission report was ignored by the Administration, and coastal zone management was placed on the back burner along with the other ocean policy recommendations. It was primarily through the efforts of Congress that we were finally able to get a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration established, and Congress alone led the fight for the Coastal Zone Management Act over the opposition of the Executive branch.

Now Congress, out of pure frustration over Presidential inaction, has established a National Ocean Policy Study to do what should have been done by the Administration 10 years ago. This study, which I have the honor to chair, has been operational for over a year now, and we are beginning to put all of the pieces of the puzzle together so that it makes sense. We've got a new Deepwater Port Policy, which has strong protective measures for coastal areas; we're taking a long, hard look at ocean programs to determine how they can better serve our purpose; and we've taken the lead on developing better policies for leasing and developing oil and gas resources on the outer continental shelf. Over half of the Senate is involved in this effort, and our momentum is growing daily. I think we will soon be able to put together an ocean policy that will serve both the environmental and economic interests of the country, and will bail the coastal zone out of the hot water it finds itself in today.

But until this policy is developed, our wildlife habitats along the coast hinge on our hopes for protecting the new remaining wildlife habitats along the coast hinge on the success of the coastal zone management program. All but one of the coastal states are presently participating in this new program and many are well down the road to developing their coastal zone management plans. Once these plans are developed and approved, the states will have the information and the governmental machinery to improve coastal decision-making. For the first time, states will have the ability to look intelligently at inter-relationships between human activities and the fragile coastal environment. And for the first time they will be in a position to establish some priorities as to what kinds of activities are in the public interest. More importantly, the rate and extent of wetland destruction and pollution can be closely monitored and dealt with accordingly.

It is perhaps one of the cruelest ironies of our time, that most human activities take place in our most fragile and finite of geological areas—the coastal zone. This is even more true when it comes to energy development. Where is most of the energy development in this country going to be in the next few years? Where will the support facilities for offshore oil and gas development be located? Where will the thousands of miles of pipelines, railroads and other transportation facilities have to be built to get the oil ashore and onto the consumer? And where will it be refined? The answer to all of these questions is only too obvious—the coastal zone will be asked to absorb it all.

This means the coastal zone management must play an active role in selecting sites suitable for energy development and identifying and protecting those that should not be developed at all. This is why the Ocean Policy Study has been spending so much time

on the offshore oil issue, and it is why we have developed a legislative package to drastically reform our leasing and management policies and assume their coordination with state coastal planning efforts.

The Administration has had an amazingly simplistic view on offshore development which has done much to add to the confusion. I think if one factor stands out in our study of the OCS leasing program, it is that the Federal government and the coastal states do not have enough information on which to make decisions about development or to gauge the extent of its impacts.

Back during the energy crisis, the Administration suddenly decided that we needed to be self-sufficient in energy... a goal easier stated than attained. Secretary Morton, or someone in the Administration, came up with the idea that leasing large acreages on the OCS would somehow solve our problems. The figure 10 million acres was pulled out of the hat and we were on our way.

There were however a few things which Interior failed to consider in developing its program. For example, they didn't know how much oil was out there, what the coastal and marine impacts would be, or whether the oil companies could successfully develop 10 million acres a year considering the shortages of capital and tubular steel. In short, the whole program was half-baked and raised so many problems that it has taken Congress over a year to straighten it all out.

A striking example of what happens to estuaries, marshes, and wetlands along the coast when big oil moves in is right here on our doorstep. We have only to go to Louisiana and fly low over the area south of New Orleans. If we do, we will see mile after mile of destroyed wetlands... pipelines crisscrossing everywhere... a small oil spill here, a tank farm there... refineries, staging areas, dredging and filling... it's all there in living color.

And the development doesn't end there. It goes inland, up the Mississippi to Baton Rouge... over a hundred miles from the mouth of the Mississippi. One can travel that stretch of water in a boat and never lose sight of industrial development which either supports, or feeds off of, offshore oil.

So, let's not kid ourselves for a minute that offshore oil does not dramatically affect the coastal environment. In the last 40 years Louisiana's coast has become an oil coast, and as a result over 17 square miles of valuable productive wetlands are lost every year to some new pipeline or support facility. This is what the Atlantic Coast can expect, this is what California is now faced with, and it is why we have got to give greater attention to proper siting of facilities and protection of wetlands now, before the oil starts coming ashore.

And believe me, we don't have the luxury of debating whether or not offshore development is desirable. The Arabs have already made that decision for us. It is left for us to make the best of a bad situation.

As chairman of the National Ocean Policy Study, I have recommended a number of measures which I feel will help provide the balance we need between energy development and the environment. One bill I have introduced would establish a program of government-sponsored exploratory drilling so that we can determine before we lease exactly how much oil is out there, where it is located, and where it will be coming ashore. This system would provide coastal States with the necessary time and information to complete their coastal zone management programs and to get ready for what's coming. It would allow areas suitable and unsuitable for energy development to be identified, and planning and management decisions could be made in advance to assure wetland and estuarine areas are properly protected. More

importantly, the offshore resources will be managed and leased according to national need rather than the whim of the oil companies.

Another bill I have introduced, S. 586, the Coastal Zone Environment Act of 1975, is aimed at assuring access to public beaches and preservation of islands. While these problems are not necessarily related to energy development, the expected onslaught of this development will increase the competition for the small amount of undeveloped land that is left... and I am concerned that the public just might come up holding the short end of the stick. So, my bill would amend the Coastal Zone Management Act to require State programs to include plans for providing citizen access to public beaches and for preservation of islands. Also the bill would provide up to \$50 million a year in grant assistance to assist State and local governments in acquiring, if necessary, those undeveloped beach and island areas they consider important enough to preserve and protect.

Both of these bills are firmly based on the premise that offshore development activities, deepwater ports, or any type of energy facilities siting should be closely coordinated with the activities of State coastal zone planning agencies. In many States, the Coastal Zone Agency and the Wildlife Agency are one and the same. So the knowledge and expertise about local wetlands problems is there, and can be brought to bear in the decision-making. These agencies should be given the strong Federal support they need—financial, technical or otherwise—to get the job done. And they definitely should be consulted in the preparation of drilling programs for the OCS, because it will be they—and not the boys at BLM—who will have to shoulder the burden of ameliorating the adverse impacts associated with offshore development.

So, in response to the question, can estuaries and energy development exist together in the coastal zone, the answer is yes... but. Yes they can exist together... but not without proper planning, management, and information about offshore oil. The Coastal Zone Management Act already provides the necessary management structure, and the legislative program I have outlined to you today can provide the rest.

I am hopeful we can expedite this legislation and get a bill passed by summer. Clearly, we cannot live with the status quo, and we can't live with the oil companies making the big decisions about the future of our coastal resources. To continue in this manner could mean disaster for the few remaining productive estuaries on the east coast and could destroy the breeding grounds for thousands of species of wildlife and waterfowl.

EDUCATION APPROPRIATION VOTE

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 16, when the House voted to appropriate \$7.8 billion in funds for education programs, we did so without a recorded vote. I feel strongly that providing quality education must be one of the top priorities of our Nation, even and perhaps especially in times of economic difficulty. I would, therefore, like to say that I voted in favor of the passage of the education appropriations bill, and I would have done the same if the vote had been by rollcall.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

HON. HELEN S. MEYNER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mrs. MEYNER. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, I introduced H.R. 5731, a bill to provide additional humanitarian assistance authorizations for South Vietnam and Cambodia for fiscal year 1975 in the amount of \$100,000,000. Today, Representatives ABZUG, BINGHAM, and I are reintroducing the bill in the amount of \$200,000,000 along with 21 cosponsors. The events of the past week have reinforced my opinion that humanitarian assistance for the suffering victims of war in Indochina should be provided, under the auspices of international organizations and private agencies, to all those in need.

The administration of relief aid by governments is ineffective when those governments are corrupt, or fighting for their lives. We have no more assurance that the Saigon Government will deliver relief assistance to people in need than that they will use American military supplies to fight rather than leaving them behind for the PRG. The Saigon Government is simply not trustworthy.

Furthermore, the extent of human suffering reaches far beyond the enclaves still controlled by Saigon. There are millions of refugees in dire need of food, medicine, and shelter in areas now controlled by the Khmer Rouge and the PRG.

Fortunately, there are several organizations that are already working to alleviate suffering in all areas of Indochina.

These include UNICEF, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Red Cross, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mennonites. These organizations are already in place and can make good use of the funds authorized by this legislation.

I believe that the internationalization of humanitarian assistance is an idea whose time has come. I have been deeply disturbed by the tendency of this administration to use food aid for political purposes, instead of a means to reduce human suffering. If our purpose is to help those in need, it seems clear that we should give those funds to organizations which have established good records of impartiality, competence, compassion, and efficiency. The time to begin is now.

The following members of Congress have agreed to cosponsor this measure:

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 5731

Hon. John Burton (D-Calif.).
Hon. Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.).
Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.).
Hon. Robert W. Edgar (D-Pa.).
Hon. James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.).
Hon. Romano L. Mazzoli (D-Ky.).
Hon. Edwin B. Forsythe (R-N.J.).
Hon. Michael J. Harrington (D-Mass.).
Hon. Richard L. Ottinger (D-N.Y.).
Hon. Peter W. Rodino (D-N.J.).
Hon. James C. Corman (D-Calif.).
Hon. Paul E. Tsongas (D-Mass.).
Hon. Edward W. Pattison (D-N.Y.).
Hon. George Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.).

Hon. Fortney H. Stark (D-Calif.).
Hon. Frederick W. Richmond (D-N.Y.).
Hon. John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio).
Hon. Andrew Maguire (D-N.J.).
Hon. Toby Moffet (D-Conn.).
Hon. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa).
Hon. Elizabeth Holtzman (D-N.Y.).

POLITICAL ROLE REVERSALS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Rod MacLeish's article "Political Role Reversals" which appeared in the Washington Post, Friday, April 18, 1975, is worth reading and thinking about.

It follows:

POLITICAL ROLE REVERSALS

(By Rod MacLeish)

One wondered who, precisely, was who. Midway through the evening of April 10th a large, chattering gathering of Washingtonians—most of whom would have called themselves liberals—hushed to listen to Gerald Ford deliver his first State of the World message to Congress.

The television sets carried blurred pictures of Mr. Ford addressing a House chamber with many empty seats. His speech itself was wearily long, badly composed and riddled with the hortative cornballisms of high Rotarian style. It was also passionately meant and the most important Ford address since the first one he gave as President.

On the Hill, two Democratic freshmen walked out in protest.

At a banquet downtown, the dining room, conveniently equipped with television sets, was swept with snickers as Mr. Ford pleaded for more military aid to South Vietnam. The snickers became scattered guffaws as the President argued this country's moral obligation to "tens of thousands of . . . South Vietnamese intellectuals, professors and teachers, editors and opinion leaders. . . ."

My notes for that evening record one man's muttered complaint that his intelligence was being insulted and the half-plastered maunders of another diner about "the goddam hick from Grand Rapids."

Given a change in years, a Missouri twang instead of the flat accent of central Michigan, a Congress numbered Eighty instead of Ninety-Four and one could have been sitting at a dinner of the National Association of Manufacturers in 1948 listening to Harry Truman broadcast an appeal for the Marshall Plan.

That evening symbolized an extraordinary role-reversal that time and Vietnam have created in Washington. The case for Mr. Truman's optimistic internationalism is now argued by a conservative, Republican President while the leadership of the liberal, Democratic Congress at times evokes the pessimistic shade of Robert A. Taft Sr.

The Marshall Plan was based on the assumption of a world susceptible to the ministrations of reason and assistance. Yesterday Secretary of State Kissinger appeared before the American Society of Newspaper Editors to argue, for the Ford administration, that the United States could still influence events through "our purposefulness, our perseverance, our creativity, our power and our perceived reliability."

The anguishing end of the American Indochina misadventure has led many Democrats to cosmic pessimism. "I know there's a blood bath going on," Senator Pastore is quoted as

saying in the New York Times of April 8, "but I don't think we have the will in this country to change it in the least." The operative gloom comes in the word "will."

In the context of the moment, the role-reversal carries some logic on both sides.

Mr. Ford, as the last Vietnam-era President and as a contender for the 1976 Republican nomination against the likes of Ronald Reagan, wants the historic record to show that he did everything he could for the Indochina cause right up to its finale.

The 94th Congress, remembering the Tonkin Gulf con game and sick over the Vietnamese corruption that sopped up American lives, money and belief, rightly refuses any more military aid to any government headed by Nguyen Van Thieu and wants the present suffering to end swiftly in the only way now possible—with a North Vietnamese victory.

What bothers me about the role-reversal is not its application by the President and the Congress to the issues of the moment.

Rather, I am suspicious that the embrace of the principles of liberal internationalism by conservatives to the right of President Ford is just a respectable way of pursuing old anti-Communist passions by military means. And, in the scorn of liberals for Mr. Ford's current arguments, there is implicit scorn for the principles that he has co-opted—or to which he may be a genuine convert.

The grotesque result of great principles applied in wrong-headed ways or used as an excuse for persistence in inappropriate causes does not invalidate the principles themselves.

Vietnam was the logic of the cold war carried to gory and pointless extremes. The original logic of the cold war was created by liberal Democrats for the simple reason that they were the people in charge when Stalin began indulging his totalitarian lust all over Eastern Europe and the Balkans.

What liberalism tried to achieve in those years—in struggles against the Soviets abroad and the right-wing cynicism of McCarthy, Jenner, Nixon and Welker at home—was the possibility of a world that was both pluralistic and tranquil.

The confrontation with communism, in that liberal view, was not based on some missionary belief than Marx's arcane theories were heresies that needed expunging from the earth. Rather, the United States deployed its economic and military power against communism because it was the political device that the Soviet Union was using in its threat to peace and pluralism.

In the last words he ever wrote, Franklin Roosevelt warned that "we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace. . . ."

That, to me anyway, is the central principle to classic American liberal internationalism. It is still an operable principle in the world's altered condition if it could be resurrected in its original form and forgiven the aberrations that have taken place in its name.

The principle is being mashed between the reversed roles of post-Vietnam Washington. Between its exploitation for the wrong reasons and its denigration by the disillusioned children of its liberal creators, American commitment to the tortuous arrangements for a world that is both pluralistic and peaceful faces extinction.

An old English music hall ballad sang of "The World Turned Upside Down." The title could be applied to the quality of belief in contemporary Washington. Knees are being jerked in disjointed ways hereabouts whereas minds should be devoted to long thoughts about where it all went wrong and how it can be set to rights.

A CALL FOR RESTRUCTURE OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, I had the privilege of appearing before a joint session of the Senate Government Operations Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations and Reports, Accounting and Management for the purpose of presenting testimony on the administration's proposed Utilities Act of 1975.

There is certainly no question that we have a serious electric utility problem. Substantial changes in the nature of the utility business are making it increasingly difficult for utilities, relying on private money markets, to finance needed future construction at rates which their customers can afford.

I am strongly opposed, however, to the administrations approach to this problem and wish to share with my colleagues my reasons for taking this position. The text of my testimony before the Senate subcommittees follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON BEFORE THE SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 17, 1975

Mr. Chairman: I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear today to testify on the Administration's proposals regarding further regulation of the nation's electric utilities. Last month, the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations and Reports, Accounting, and Management released findings that last year, utility bills rose by approximately \$9.6 billion, of which about \$6.5 billion was due to fuel adjustment charges.

These massive rate increases have created substantial hardships for consumers, especially those on low or fixed incomes, homeowners who have the misfortune to be dependent on electric heat, businessmen and industry.

But the legislation now before the Committee, the Utilities Act of 1975, is not designed to afford relief to overburdened consumers. Rather, in keeping with the policy of the present and former Administrations it is designed to increase utility bills still further in order to significantly increase stockholder returns, thereby alleviating what the Administration views as a financing crisis in the industry.

The White House, in its information packet which accompanied the State of the Union message, estimated that the Utilities Act, if approved, would raise the price of electricity by about 20% next year. Based on last year's utility revenues, this translates into approximately \$7.2 billion in additional revenues for the nation's privately-owned utility companies.

This estimate may be conservative. An independent study by the Economics Division of the Congressional Research Service indicates that just the cost of allowing construction work and pollution control equipment in the rate base will cost consumers \$7.8 billion next year, and that this sum will increase significantly in future years.

Is it necessary to give the utility industry a \$7.8 billion shot in the arm next year at the expense of residential and industrial consumers? And, if so, are the proposals outlined in the Utilities Act of 1975 the proper vehicles for providing that relief? These are the questions which confront the Congress.

Section 702(a)(5) of the Act defines the problems as the Administration views it. It states: "Shortages and unreliable supplies of electricity caused by the financial problems of the utilities which now exist or are imminent and jeopardize the normal flow of interstate and foreign commerce by creating severe economic dislocation, including loss of jobs, closing of factories and businesses, and curtailments of vital public services."

Unquestionably, we do have a serious utility problem. Substantial changes in the nature of the utility business are making it increasingly difficult for utilities, relying on private money markets, to finance needed future construction at rates which their customers will be able to afford.

But the available information does not indicate that there is a short-term danger of inadequate or unreliable supplies of electricity, or any short-term inability of utilities to finance needed construction.

The major utility problem right now in New England, and elsewhere, is an oversupply of electric generating capacity—an oversupply created by the combination of consumer conservation and general economic stagnation. Today, over half of New England's generating capacity is lying idle for lack of demand.

Utility net income actually increased nationwide by about 6% last year. Utilities are able to float their bond issues, and at declining interest rates. Stockholders are currently earning over 10% on equity, and recent utility stock issues have been successful.

The legislative proposals now before this Committee had their origins last summer when both the short-term and long-term outlook for the utility industry were indeed grim. Interest rates were skyrocketing; Con Ed's dividend was omitted; utility stocks were selling at half their book value; and bond issues were being sold at unacceptable interest rates.

Last July, John Sawhill invited state regulatory commissioners to a private meeting at the Federal Energy Administration to lobby them to speed up financial aid to the utilities. The meeting was postponed when consumer and environmental groups protested being excluded. However, work continued in the FEA and White House for ways to require state commissions to be more responsive to utility needs. The proposals contained in the Utilities Act of 1975 are the direct product of that concern.

The proper criteria for measuring the value of these proposals is whether they contribute to developing a rational and coherent regulatory policy—one designed to afford protection to consumers and investors.

In my opinion, the proposals with two possible exceptions, fail to meet this criteria. They represent arbitrary departures from well-established regulatory practices and procedures—departures whose primary purpose is to quickly jack up the paper profits of utilities. It also may represent an unconstitutional encroachment on traditional state regulatory powers. If I may, I would like to discuss each of the six sections of the Act.

Section 704 prohibits any state regulatory agency from suspending a rate increase for more than 5 months. If after 5 months a decision has not been reached, the rate increase automatically goes into effect subject to refund. The rationale behind this section is to lower financing costs by speeding up the regulatory process. In reality, it will not achieve its purpose.

State regulatory commissions simply do not possess the budget and staff expertise necessary to analyze a rate increase. The Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, for example, has only one lawyer and two accountants on its staff. Its annual operating budget is lower than Massachusetts Electric's sales and advertising budget. Yet, in addition to regulating the billion dollar

a year electric utility industry, the DPU must also regulate natural gas companies, the telephone company, water companies, and private transport carriers.

Since it is highly unlikely that private utilities will end their historic practice of padding rate increase requests, Section 704 will have two effects. One, it will result in unjustified rate increases for private utilities resulting from only a cursory examination of the filings. Two, it will allow utilities to put their full rate increases in effect subject to later refund.

As I learned in a recent New England Power Company case before the FPC, revenues collected by a utility which are subject to refund cannot be used to meet bond indenture, and other financial requirements. This means Section 704 will not make it any easier for utilities to raise revenues, or lower financing rates.

Nor will it speed up the regulatory process. The Federal Power Commission, a well-funded and staffed commission, currently has a maximum 5 months suspension period. At the present time, rate applications filed by Massachusetts utilities in 1971 and 1972 are still pending before the FPC, while the utilities themselves have been collecting the full yet unsanctioned rates from their customers. It hardly seems likely that sorely understaffed and funded state commissions will perform any better than the Federal Power Commission.

Section 705 of the Act requires state regulatory commissions to permit utilities to use fuel adjustment charges. In addition, it requires that the automatic pass-through reflect 100% or higher fuel costs.

As the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations and Reports, Accounting, and Management pointed out in the recent committee print on the fuel adjustment clause, the 100% pass-through has led to significant abuse by private utility companies.

In my own state, Massachusetts, utilities using a two month billing cycle applied the second month's higher fuel adjustment factor to the first month's usage; thereby reaping excessive profits. In other states, companies owning their own coal mines have overcharged consumers by millions of dollars by applying the spot market price on coal to their own internally-produced coal. Other utilities have included such non-fuel costs as executive salaries and environmental charges in the fuel adjustment.

But these abuses, serious as they are, are not the main problem with the fuel adjustment clause. By permitting a utility to pass on 100% of its increased fuel charges, the incentive to resist price increases by fuel suppliers is undermined.

Just recently, federal investigators have uncovered massive overcharges by oil companies to utility companies. The amount of these overcharges may ultimately exceed one billion dollars. I strongly believe, that if the utility industry, which is as large and powerful as the oil industry, did not have the convenience of the fuel adjustment clause, many of these overcharges would not have taken place.

A number of state commissions, including West Virginia, Vermont, Florida, Montana, North Carolina and New York have limited the amount of pass-through under the fuel adjustment clause, or are considering the elimination of the clause in favor of expedited rate cases.

Section 705 will eliminate the possibility for fuel adjustment clause reform. And it will do so at the very time when fuel prices are beginning to stabilize, thereby eliminating the very rationale for which the fuel adjustment clause was initiated.

Section 706 makes it unlawful for any state commission to prohibit discounts for the off-peak sale of electric power. While I have no quarrel with the theory behind this section, which is to promote system efficiency by nar-

rowing the differential between peak and off-peak demand, I do believe that decision making on rate structure must lie with the states—not the Federal government.

Different regions have different problems. Rate setting, despite claims of utilities to the contrary, involves decisions of social policy—how to allocate the burdens of paying for a necessary, and increasingly expensive resource. While I would hope that jurisdictions which prohibit off-peak price differentials will act to remove the prohibitions, I do not believe the Federal government should mandate such action.

Section 707, which requires state commissions to include construction work in progress in the rate base, adds one more layer of irrationality to a regulatory accounting system already replete with irrational and inconsistent procedures.

Simply stated, this section requires utility customers to provide utility investors with full profits on facilities which have been completed and are not providing any benefits to utility consumers.

For years the Federal Power Commission, and almost all state commissions, have rejected utility requests to include construction work in progress in the rate base. Now, the Administration, looking for any way possible to raise utility profits over and above what regulatory commissions have deemed proper levels of return, is attempting to force this artificial and unjustified accounting procedure on all regulatory commissions.

If this section is enacted, it will raise utility dividends by over \$7 billion next year. This \$7 billion will be taken from already overburdened consumers. But in addition to the economic effects of this section, it will have other effects as well.

In the future, any time a utility feels it wants a higher dividend rate, all it need do is begin construction of a new plant—whether or not that plant is needed. What little incentive that now exists to purchase electricity from an already operating plant with excess capacity will be eliminated, since no profit can be earned by a purchaser of power, but a profit can be earned by beginning construction of a new plant.

Section 708, which requires state commissions to permit utilities to earn a profit on environmental control devices, is another section, like peak load pricing, where I find myself in substantive agreement with the utilities and the Administration. A scrubber system, or a cooling tower ought to be considered as an integral and necessary part of a power plant. They are not add-ons—they are a necessary component of a total power generating system, and should be treated in the same fashion as other capital outlays. Inclusion of pollution control equipment in the rate base might even have the helpful side effect of stemming the all out assault by utilities on our current environmental laws and standards.

But whether the federal government should, or constitutionally can, require state commissions to change their own regulatory standards, is another matter. I am frankly hesitant to establish a precedent for dictating regulatory policy to state commissions. For every worthwhile reform being proposed like peak-load pricing—which most state commissions permit any way—there seem to be two proposals designed to undermine regulatory effectiveness.

Finally, Section 709 requires state commissions to allow utilities to use the normalization method of accounting. Simply stated, this Section means that the savings a utility can realize through the use of special tax breaks cannot be passed on to the utilities' customers. The customers will continue to pay rates as if the special tax breaks did not exist, while the utility itself gets to keep the money generated by the tax break for its own use. This Section, like the construction work in progress section, is simply a gimmick

to hike up profits at the expense of the consumer—profits which would not be legitimate if calculated under accepted accounting standards.

Early in my testimony, I raised the question as to whether the utility industry needed the kind of quick-fix increase in profits which this legislation will provide. If the current market is an indication, the answer is no.

But there is a very serious long-term problem regarding the delivery of electric power—a problem which this legislation does not address. The problem is that the private utility industry, relying solely on private financing, cannot provide the electric power every American needs, at rates which he will be able to afford.

There has been a fundamental change in the nature of the utility industry. A modern power plant now costs in the range of one billion dollars. Capital costs are continuing to rise steadily. The limits of economies of scale have been reached—marginal cost of new power is rising. The absolute need for power despite the recent slowdown due to conservation and the depressed economy—is rising. And the land use, safety, and environmental problems posed by modern power technologies are growing more and more serious.

The accounting changes proposed by the Ford Administration do nothing to address these fundamental problems. What we need is a basic rethinking of our policy regarding the financing and delivery of what has become a basic and indispensable necessity of industrial life.

The object of our rethinking ought not to be how to raise rates as quickly as possible, but how to stabilize rates so that all consumers can afford the power they need, and business and industry can expand their operations without incurring enormous power costs.

Senator Metcalf has taken the lead here in the Congress. The National Grid bill, which he has introduced in the last three Congresses, addressed this problem squarely. By integrating the national transmission network, thereby significantly increasing the efficiency of power delivery, and providing for public financing of new power facilities, the National Grid concept can stabilize the rate spiral.

In addition, there are a number of efforts across the country, including one in Massachusetts of which I am a sponsor, to create state power authorities to publicly finance and operate new power plants.

Like water, sewers, roads, police and fire protection, electric power is a public service that ought to be publicly-provided on a non-profit basis. The Ford Administration proposals reflect the fact that without artificially imposed increases in investor return, the private sector will not provide the funds for our new plant construction. What the proposals ignore, however, is whether the consuming public can afford the higher rates that these changes mandate. In my opinion, it cannot.

It is my hope that the Congress, after rejecting the Utilities Act of 1975, will begin a serious effort to fundamentally restructure the manner in which an essential commodity is delivered.

AMERICAN RED CROSS HONORS GILBERT L. GRILL

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratify-

ing to learn that one of my constituents, Mr. Gilbert L. Grill, of Paramount, Calif., has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit which is the highest award given by the Red Cross to an individual who saves or sustains a life by skills learned in a Red Cross volunteer training program.

Mr. Grill, trained in Red Cross first aid, was at work on last September 9 when a fellow employee suddenly became rigid and collapsed. Upon determining that the man had stopped breathing, Mr. Grill immediately removed an obstruction in the breathing passage and began artificial respiration. Several minutes later the victim started to breathe, but when he suffered a relapse, Mr. Grill readministered mouth-to-mouth respiration.

Because of Gilbert Grill's calm and courageous response to this emergency, the stricken man was able to be transported to the hospital where he successfully recovered from his heart attack. There is no question but that Mr. Grill's valiant action saved this man's life.

In this time when we read so often of persons who are taking life, it is reaffirming to learn about someone like Gilbert Grill with a reverence for human life.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN WHALEN'S ANNUAL POLL OF CONSTITUENTS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report that my annual poll of Third Congressional District residents again has produced more than 20,000 replies.

I am gratified by the interest this response reflects in the issues facing the Federal Government in 1975. For the information of my colleagues, I insert herewith the responses expressed in percentages rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent:

1. Would you favor increased U.S. food contributions to starving nations if it meant that each American would have to consume less food?

Yes ----- 39.8
No ----- 45.2
Undecided ----- 15.5

2. What is your position regarding the creation of an independent Federal Consumer Protection Agency?

Favor ----- 61.0
Oppose ----- 25.1
Undecided ----- 13.7

3. What is your position regarding the Constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Buckley which would prohibit abortion except when "reasonable medical certainty exists that the continuation of the pregnancy will cause the death of the mother?"

Favor ----- 31.4
Oppose ----- 58.8
Undecided ----- 9.8

4. What is your position regarding imposition of across-the-board wage, price, rent, interest, and profit controls as a means of combatting inflation?

Favor 51.1
 Oppose 36.0
 Undecided 12.9

As a means of conserving energy, and thereby combatting one major cause of inflation, what is your position regarding:

5. A 20c per gallon tax increase on gasoline?

Favor 12.1
 Oppose 82.0
 Undecided 6.0

6. The implementation of a gas rationing program?

Favor 38.4
 Oppose 50.5
 Undecided 11.3

7. A tax on new automobiles in direct proportion to their engine inefficiency?

Favor 52.3
 Oppose 35.3
 Undecided 12.4

A YOUNG VICTIM OF C/F ASKS: "WHAT IS PURPOSE?"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for those of us who are in good health to live our lives as if we will continue indefinitely in our current patterns of existence. Only when illness strikes do we become aware of our own mortality and do we begin to think about the real meaning of our lives.

One young lady who recently lost her lifelong battle with cystic fibrosis, Debbie Bean, gave a great deal of thought to the question of what our real purpose is in this world.

Unfortunately, Debbie was unable to graduate with her class in Salem, N.H. She wrote a poem, however, which was found by her mother and presented to the class of 1974. This poem was printed in the class yearbook and later reprinted by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation in its Winter 1975 news bulletin.

It is my hope that one day in the not too distant future a cure will be found for cystic fibrosis and young people like Debbie Bean will be able to live full and complete lives.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article concerning Debbie and the poem which she wrote as it appeared in the National C.F. News Bulletin's Winter 1975 issue and insert it in to the RECORD at this time:

DEBBIE LEAVES LEGACY—"WHAT IS PURPOSE?"

Debbie Bean did not graduate with her class, New Hampshire, classmates, but she left a legacy with them that is meaningful to everyone—the very young, the very old.

Debbie, who lost her lifelong battle with C/F prior to graduation, had written a poem found later by her mother, who presented it to the class of 1974 at Salem.

The poem was printed in the class yearbook, and the Foundation shares it now for the benefit it may bring to those who read it and in tribute to the wonderfully hopeful, courageous, and beautiful person who wrote it.

"People in this world need security and love.

They need to feel compassion and understanding for the human race.

That is what is lacking in our society today.

People have to be the same.

They are afraid that they will be laughed at if they are different.

I like to be different; what's wrong with being different?

I am my own self.

I love life and enjoy living and thinking what I want and not what everyone else wants.

Nowadays, so many kids are on dope and they put you down if you're straight.

I don't take dope because I want to live, not die, and if you need dope to be happy then that's not true happiness.

Happiness is waking up in the morning to people's voices and the smell of food, with sunshine streaming through the window.

It's the sound of laughter and smiling faces; twinkling eyes and beautiful people.

It's flowers, warmth, and birds singing in the spring and cold white ground, singing Christmas carols and building snowmen in the winter.

It's a loving family, lots of friends and exciting nights.

It's at times solitude and tranquility.

It is a wonderful gift God gave and no one has the right to give it away or take it from us except God.

Happiness is feeling, caring, loving, and understanding nature and people and thanking God for a wonderful gift that no one else can give us.

I asked God, "What is purpose?"

He said, "You are the purpose."

RHODESIAN CHROME ESSENTIAL FOR U.S. SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately some Members of Congress are renewing their efforts to ban the import of Rhodesian chrome. The latest attempt is H.R. 1287, which has been approved by a subcommittee of the House International Relations Committee. I am strongly opposed to H.R. 1287 and any bill that would reimpose the chrome embargo.

Metallurgical grade chrome is essential for our defense needs and our domestic economy. It is the only grade economically suitable for steelmaking applications.

Approximately two-thirds of the world's supply of metallurgical chrome is located in Rhodesia. If Congress prohibits the entry of Rhodesian chrome, it would be a devastating blow to the U.S. specialty steel industry. Thousands of American steelworkers would lose their jobs.

And let us not downplay this fact. The major issue is American jobs. If Congress votes to reimpose the embargo, severe unemployment will result in the specialty steel industry.

Reliance on chrome from the Soviet Union—virtually the only supplier of metallurgical chrome to the United States if Rhodesia is eliminated—would mean a large increase in price. We have already been given an idea of what this would be like. In January of 1975 Soviet chrome

merchants announced delivery cutbacks of 35 percent and price increases of 100 percent.

About 20 percent of the raw materials cost of stainless steel results from chrome. If our foreign competitors have access to low cost, high quality chrome, while we are forced to pay premium prices to Soviet suppliers, the American steel industry simply will not be able to compete against imported stainless steel.

Some argue that our purchase of Rhodesian chrome makes us the only nation violating U.N. sanctions. Compliance by other countries, however, is a myth. Although our competitors in the world steel market speak disapprovingly of our violation of the sanctions, they themselves openly or covertly import Rhodesian chrome.

It is also argued that Congress must support this bill because of the United Nations resolution imposing sanctions against Rhodesia. This argument is ridiculous. The United States is not subservient to any international organization. The U.S. Congress, not the United Nations. I would hope that every Congressman places American interests ahead of some United Nations resolution.

It would be sheer folly for Congress to adopt sanctions against Rhodesia when it would mean the loss of thousands of American steelworkers' jobs. For the sake of the U.S. economy, our specialty steel industry and American jobs, I urge Congress to vote against H.R. 1287.

RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian American Council of Boston has written to me in support of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. I join with my Lithuanian friends in Boston in supporting this restoration. For my colleagues' information, I am making available the resolution of the Lithuanian American Council of Boston marking the 57th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence:

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston, assembled this 16th day of February, 1975, at the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens Club to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1975, marks the 57th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State, which was won and protected by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during the wars of independence of 1919-1920, and recognized by the international community of States;

That the Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all the existing treaties and the principles of international law;

That subjection of peoples to alien domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the right to self-determination and the

other fundamental human rights; is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation;

That so many countries under foreign colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states; while Lithuania having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries is now subjugated to the most brutal Russian oppression and is nothing but a colony of the Soviet empire;

That though the Soviet Union, through programs of resettlement of peoples, intensified russification, suppression of religious freedom and political persecutions, continues in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved:

That we demand immediate release of all, withdraw its military forces, administrative apparatus and the imported Russian Colonists from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

That we demand immediate release of all Lithuanians who are imprisoned for political and religious reasons and who for years are lingering in various Soviet jails and concentration camps;

That in expressing our gratitude to the United States Government for its firm position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, we request an activation of the non-recognition principle by stressing at every opportunity the denial of freedom and national independence to Lithuania and the other Baltic countries.

PATAPSCO NECK PEOPLE WANT BRIDGE NAMED FOR KEY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in September 1814, the new American Nation was in its portion of the Napoleonic war with its former colonial master, Great Britain.

Baltimore, Md., was the target of the British.

Baltimore did not fall.

By repulsing both land and sea attacks, in the Battle of North Point and the bombardment of Fort McHenry, Baltimore's citizen soldiers and the garrison at Fort McHenry gave new hope to the struggling Nation and the song which has become our National Anthem.

Schoolchildren everywhere know of Fort McHenry and the "Star-Spangled Banner." Few Americans know of the important battle which took place on the other side of Baltimore Harbor.

In a notable effort to bring out key historical events, the Patapsco Neck Historical Society and allied citizens in the Dundalk-North Point-Sparrows Point area are urging that the new bridge being built across the Outer Harbor to link Anne Arundel and Baltimore Counties be named for Francis Scott Key.

When the new bridge is built, you will be able to drive across and look almost straight down at the spot where Key's ship was anchored during the bombardment.

The society is also calling for a turn-off at the northern end of the bridge, so that visitors may see Fort McHenry, across the harbor, from the same perspective Key had.

I am pleased to present to my colleagues an account of the society's efforts which appeared recently in the Baltimore Sun:

PATAPSCO NECK PEOPLE WANT BRIDGE NAMED FOR KEY

(By Isaac Rehert)

Patapsco Neck, known to contemporary Baltimoreans as the home of Sparrows Point Steel Mills and other heavy industries, is memorable in United States history for the Battle of North Point.

Today, the superficial traveler along the main boulevards through and surrounding the town of Dundalk is most easily impressed with the tawdry atmosphere of automobile emporia and hamburger palaces.

During the War of 1812, those same boulevards, then pleasant curving country roads, were the path chosen by a seemingly invincible British Army bent on invading the metropolises of Baltimore and laying it waste.

That army was stopped at the Battle of North Point, which took place on land simultaneously with the bombardment of nearby Fort McHenry by sea.

Now, in 1975, throughout Patapsco Neck's population—off the main roads, where thinking, feeling people live—passionately proud devotees of this area's contribution to history have been organizing to make the outer world aware.

Their leader and spokesman is Ben Womer, founder and president of the Patapsco Neck Historical Society, who feels that on several counts, his beloved Patapsco Neck has been slighted in the records for posterity. And as the nation's bicentennial approaches, he has proposals for making amends.

Amends have to do with a new bridge that is now being built and with Battle Acre, a monument in Dundalk commemorating the Battle of North Point.

The bridge is one being built as part of the outer harbor crossing from Sollers Point to Hawkins Point. Mr. Womer and his colleagues in the society point out that, contrary to what many history books say, Francis Scott Key, when he wrote the Star-Spangled Banner, was not interned on a British vessel just off the coast of Fort McHenry.

Rather, he was on an American vessel no more than 200 yards from Sollers Point, on the Patapsco Neck side of the river.

Charles H. Echols, Jr., a Dundalk resident and history buff, has made a professional-quality slide show of the battle (which Rotary clubs are exhibiting in schools) and Mr. Womer has a map showing details of the battle: the fort at the end of Whetstone point, the battleships of the British fleet lined up in an arc spanning the harbor facing the fort and the spot where Key's ship was held, further down the river near the mouth of Bear Creek. (Remarkably, no one seems ever to have recorded the name of that ship.)

"Now," says Mr. Womer, "when they get this new bridge built here on the neck, you'll be almost able to look out of your car straight down on the point where Francis Scott Key's ship was anchored."

"There's nothing around here—not a building, not a road—that's been named after Francis Scott Key and we here on Patapsco Neck think this new bridge ought to be named after him."

"We also think they should build a turn-off at the entrance, so tourists could stop their cars and get out and look for a while."

The society has been pressuring. It has had support from the Baltimore County

Council and received acknowledgement (but no commitments) from the state Department of Transportation.

On March 17, the state Senate and the House of Delegates passed a resolution approving the name, "Francis Scott Key Memorial Bridge," but the society still feels uncertain. They want everyone who agrees with their stand to write letters and keep up a barrage of public sentiment until the final naming is properly authorized.

On the matter of Battle Acre, Mr. Womer, who wants to clean up and repair the monument in time for the bicentennial, feels he has gotten lost in the maze of state bureaucracy.

The monument is an acre-large rectangle of land, with grass, an iron fence around it, concrete pillars in its center and an authentic cannon from the Battle of North Point.

Over the years, the site has been neglected. Cannonballs that used to be on display with the weapon have been stolen or lost; the gate is askew; the fence is broken in spots and the square, pitchdark at nightfall, has become a haven for youthful carousers and drinkers who leave their beer cans and bottles strewn around on the grass in an unsightly mess.

Once a year, Mr. Womer says, shortly before the Fourth of July, workmen from the State Roads Commission come and cut the grass. But when he asks that the proper steps be taken that would make it clean and orderly, he is told that for such functions, Battle Acre is the responsibility of the National Guard.

But, says Mr. Womer, the National Guard equally, unequivocally, also disowns the place.

"I know that acre belongs to the state of Maryland because I've seen the record," he says with his usual zeal. "It was donated by a man named Jacob Houck."

"But in my time, I haven't been able to find a single department in the government that is willing to take care of the place. All we're asking is a new American flag and a decent light, so we could keep it on all through the night, so that anybody passing by could see what was happening in there. That would stop a lot of the hooligans."

"The way it is, it's a disgrace. When the dean of Gloucester Cathedral came over here all the way from England wanting to see the battlefield where the Americans had turned his country's forces back, I was ashamed to show it to him, it was that bad."

"Now, with the bicentennial coming up, there are going to be people from all over the country arriving here wanting to visit all these historical sites."

"Patapsco Neck's important in American history and Battle Acre's where all the action took place."

"People are going to want to see it, but the way it looks right now, I wouldn't be willing to show it to them."

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BURNS

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute on the passing of John A. Burns who served with us here in the House while he was the Territorial Delegate from Hawaii.

Jack Burns was a warm, personal friend of mine and I had the honor of working very closely with him to secure statehood for Hawaii since we served to-

gether on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Statehood Subcommittee.

He probably can be credited more than any other for the creation of the State of Hawaii, and was later its Governor and one of its most beloved citizens.

I have the privilege of being a member of the last congressional delegation to visit Hawaii before it became a State.

My deepest condolences go also to Beatrice Burns, his wife, and the entire family. Our last admitted State and, in fact, all the 50 States, will be a sadder place now that Jack is gone.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY
CELEBRATION OF WAIPAHU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I had the distinct pleasure of pointing out to the Members of this House that my hometown, on the outskirts of Honolulu—the town of Waipahu—was celebrating the 75th anniversary of its establishment as a sugar plantation camp. Many things have changed in Waipahu since 1897, and the sleepy plantation camp has become a residential and commercial center of some size for a good share of the population of rural Oahu.

Some things have not changed, though, and among them is the fact that the original plantation laborers, like Waipahu's present residents, placed a high premium on good, basic education. Thus it was that only a year or two after the plantation was established at Waipahu that an elementary school was set up to accommodate some 125 youngsters from Waipahu and the surrounding communities some miles distant at Pearl City, Ewa, Nanakuli, and Waiānae.

That first school year, 1899–1900, these 125 young people were under the charge of just three teachers. They came to Waipahu Elementary School by buggy, on horseback, or on foot, in the best traditions of those young people from the early days of our country who thirsted for education and self-improvement.

Waipahu Elementary School is now the oldest school in the Leeward District of Oahu. There are now nearly 1,000 students enrolled there, and the teaching and service staff totals about 70 people. The school has been joined over the years by other elementary schools in the same area, and Waipahu also has a high school to serve the growing community. But, of course, there is only one original Waipahu Elementary School and the students and staff there are commemorating the 75th anniversary of their school's founding with several programs and publication of a creative writing booklet and news magazine.

I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting Waipahu Elementary School on this auspicious occasion, and commend all the students and faculty for organiz-

ing a grand celebration on June 4, 1975, as this 75th school year comes to a successful conclusion.

THE HANDICAPPED VERSUS THE
ARCHITECTURAL BARRIER

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation making it the sense of Congress that all units of government expeditiously remove the many architectural barriers existing in our public places to the handicapped.

Although we have been moving in this direction in recent years, and many barriers have been removed, many remain preventing access and enjoyment by the handicapped.

The approaching Bicentennial anniversary will be celebrated by all of our citizens with many visiting historical landmarks and institutional centers personifying this Nation's underlying principles and development. The handicapped may not have access in many instances. We cannot allow this to happen. We should not allow this to happen especially when one considers the fact that our Constitution stipulates that the purpose of our Government includes the promotion of the general welfare, protects individual rights and fosters opportunities for all.

This Nation has the resources to remove existing barriers and to do so before our celebration starts. Many places here in Washington have made provisions for the physically impaired. There are generous quantities of information which will assist the handicapped in making their visit to Washington enjoyable and convenient. But, in a different sense, we still have present day impairments such as an individual in a wheelchair can visit the Washington Monument, but cannot see out the windows once there. The Lincoln Memorial is "inaccessible to wheelchair users" according to the National Park Service. Only one of the Smithsonian's museums provides extended displays for the blind? Why?

As the Bicentennial draws near, I am reminded of what government is supposed to do: "to do for the people what they cannot or will not do for themselves." The handicapped cannot provide their own access to public facilities, at least, not without great difficulties and resources. They are people too.

Following is the text of the concurrent resolution which I introduce:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To promote and encourage the removal of architectural barriers to the access of handicapped persons to public facilities and buildings.

Whereas the approach of the bicentennial anniversary of the founding of this country calls all of us to reaffirm the principles attendant that foundation and guiding our growth as a Nation; and

Whereas the Constitution stipulates that

the purposes of our government include the promotion of the general welfare; and

Whereas Members of this Congress have sworn to uphold and defend this most basic document and statement of principles; and

Whereas our handicapped fellow citizen have rights, not because of their disabilities, but rights which belong to all our citizens; and

Whereas many existing public buildings and facilities have architectural barriers to access and enjoyment by our handicapped fellow citizens; and

Whereas this country, as in no other time in its history, has the resources to provide for the well-being of all its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress—

(1) that the Constitutional Officers of the United States of America, administrators of institutions supported with public monies, and administrative officers of this Congress, should immediately survey facilities under their direction for all architectural barriers to the handicapped;

(2) that said officers and administrators should make available monies from their discretionary funds for the removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped; and

(3) that all other governmental units should be encouraged to make similar provisions for the handicapped citizen who reside under their jurisdiction.

ST. LOUIS GLOBE DEMOCRAT
MAKES FOOL OF FBI

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my total indignation with recent activities of the Department of Justice as they have related to me under the guise of a "so-called" continuing investigation. The Department of Justice has trampled on my constitutional rights as a citizen and overreached itself in a manner which directly violates the principle of "separation of powers." Agents of the Department of Justice have doggedly harassed present and past employees of my staff, intimidated several business and labor leaders who made legal campaign contributions to me during the 1972 elections, and created conditions which interfere with the effective discharge of my responsibilities as a duly elected Member of Congress. Relative to an earlier stage of this seemingly endless probe, 84 of my colleagues signed a letter to the Attorney General requesting that, in fairness to me, the investigation should be concluded in one way or another, indictment or absolution. To date the Attorney General a month after receipt of the letter, had not seen fit to even respond.

Accordingly, today I registered by mail a strenuous protest to the Attorney General of the United States. I seriously questioned the manner, quality, and motivation for this "so called" continuing investigation. What started out as an investigation based on a complaint in the 1974 elections filed by a candidate has now, in my opinion, mushroomed into a full scale witch hunt. It appears that a St. Louis daily newspaper, the Globe

Democrat, has retained the Justice Department as its private detective agency. The most recent collaborative escapade between the Globe Democrat and the FBI smacks of harassment, coupled with incompetency and inefficiency.

This latest charade vividly points out how the Globe Democrat is effectively using the FBI in a nefarious scheme to impugn my integrity and destroy my credibility. However, in this instance the Globe Democrat made a complete fool of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In a Globe Democrat article dated March 27, 1975, the charge was made that:

Nearly \$3,000 in political contributions to U.S. Rep. William L. Clay's three 1974 Campaign Committees is not accounted for in campaign expense reports as required by law, records showed Wednesday.

Immediately, the Globe Democrat's private detective—FBI—rose to the occasion. On Friday April 11, FBI agents started interviewing the nine alleged contributors photographing the fronts and backs of the checks contributed. Agents even went further inquiring about 1972 political contributions made to me.

This in my opinion is harassment of the most gratuitous sort. That harassment has now been extended to include those who supported me in prior elections.

If the FBI had not been in such a hurry to accept as incontrovertible fact the Globe Democrat accusations, the truth might have been ascertained very simply. The agents needed only to have reviewed the records in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the respective chairmen of the two campaign committees or my office. By doing so, they would have learned that those contributions in question had been reported as required.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice in a fashion all too common, assumed that I was guilty and set in motion an investigative juggernaut to prove it.

If a Member of the U.S. Congress is treated in such a shoddy, reckless, and irresponsible way, what chance then does an ordinary citizen in our society have to protect himself against the vendetta of a newspaper and the corresponding willingness of Federal agencies to flunkify for such an unethical newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent what is happening and call on the leadership of this body to take the necessary action to prevent the encroachment of the Justice Department upon the rights and prerogatives of the Congress.

HANOI PREPARES A BLOODBATH

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, contrary to some of the prognosticators, who told us that a "bloodbath" in Vietnam would not occur, it is already taking place. State Department

dispatches speak of such barbarities as running over refugees with Soviet trucks in order to make certain none of them escape to South Vietnamese-held territory. Selective executions, in order to establish a reign of terror, have already been taking place according to Henry Bradsher in the Washington Star of April 18. The reasons and background for this murderous train of events was recently set forth in a very succinct manner by Prof. P. J. Honey of London, the world's leading Western expert on North Vietnam, I commend this article, which appeared in the London Daily Telegraph of April 16, 1975, to the attention of my colleagues, because so many in the Congress and in the general population appear to be confused as to the true nature of communism. A bloodbath is a routine item in any Communist conquest. This was true in the case of Russia, Eastern Europe, Communist China, Cuba, and now Southeast Asia. It is a basic tenet of communism that all possible opposition has to be liquidated and/or imprisoned in order to consolidate the rule of the Communist Party. The article follows:

P. J. HONEY ON THE MEN AND POLICIES BEHIND NORTH VIETNAM'S DETERMINATION TO CONQUER THE SOUTH—HANOI PREPARES A BLOODBATH

The Vietnamese Communists are not a group of idealistic bare-foot peasants fighting with rudimentary home-made weapons to free Vietnam from foreign domination, or lovers of peace reluctantly forced into using violence against corrupt compatriots, sustained by American dollars, who are oppressing the Vietnamese nation. Sadly it is necessary to state this because so many people in the West unthinkingly accept that image, so diligently disseminated by Communists and fellow travellers, in the face of all the facts.

They are an aggressive expansionist movement who already control North Vietnam and the greater portion of the three neighbouring States of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. They are the Prussians of southeast Asia who, despite their strictures on the South Vietnamese for accepting American aid, themselves depend wholly on Russia, China and the rest of the Communist bloc for military and economic supplies. They subject the North Vietnamese people to one of the lowest living standards in the world so that their armies may engage in military conquest abroad.

First, the régime in North Vietnam is totalitarian. That is to say the totality of power resides within a single political party, the Lao Dong or Communist party, which controls the Government, the Armed Forces, the security services, the Press, radio and television, the economy, labour, the movement of people and much more besides. Citizens of North Vietnam are not free to leave the country or even to travel within it without permission. Many essential goods are rationed, there is compulsory military service and labour may be directed whenever the Communist authorities wish. Arrest is arbitrary and there is no appeal against it, while sentences are frequently Draconian, as in the case of the young man sent to prison for 14 years and deprived of civil rights for playing Western music. Some senior officials, men such as Tran Dai Nghia, chairman of State Commissions, or the vice-president of Hanoi University, Dr Le Van Thiem, actively supported Hitler.

The régime is directed by 11 men who constitute the Politburo of the Communist party central committee and who between them take every major decision. The central com-

mittee, which meets periodically, "rubber stamps" these decisions while the Government is nothing more than the executive which carries them out. There is only one Communist party in Vietnam though a nominally separate party, the People's Revolutionary party, was set up for South Vietnam in 1962 to suggest to uninformed foreigners that the Viet Cong there are independent of the North Vietnamese. During the lifetime of Ho Chi Minh the Politburo tamely accepted his direction but, since his death, differences among the members have become apparent. These concern personalities and methodology, for there is no disagreement over the ultimate goal.

Vietnamese Communism is the creation of Ho Chi Minh, and the party still embodies the characteristics with which he endowed it. The popular image of Ho as a saintly, simple-living patriot concerned only with freeing his people from foreign bondage could scarcely be more misleading. A self-proclaimed Communist, he was ruthless enough to betray the nationalist leader Phan Boi Chau to the French authorities in Shanghai to rid himself of a rival and use the reward to finance his own political activities. The simple peasant garb and gentle manner he adopted quite deliberately when he noted the political impact of Mahatma Gandhi in India. Ho had the political shrewdness to exploit Vietnamese nationalism for his own Communist objectives, and he made the ideology more palatable by expressing it in homely Vietnamese language instead of stiff Marxist-Leninist jargon.

Possibly the most traumatic experience of Ho's long life, and one which made an indelible impression on him, was the Kuomintang's sudden turn against its Communist partner in 1927, when many Chinese Communists were killed and Ho himself escaped only because of the Russian passport he held. Subsequently in Vietnam he would never tolerate the sharing of power with non-Communists and he imbued the whole party with an almost pathological fear of this. Potential rival centres of power, whether institutions or persons, are always ruthlessly eliminated.

RECORD OF MURDER

Ho's seizure of power in Hanoi was characterised by the mass killings of political rivals among the Dai Viet, the Vietnam Quoc Dan Dang, and other nationalist movements, while outstanding State officials such as Pham Quynh and Ngo Dinh Khoi, the brother of Ngo Dinh Diem, were murdered, as was the Trotskyist Ta Thu Thau. In 1954 the so-called land reform, whose slogan was "It is better to kill ten innocent people than let one enemy escape," caused the deaths of an estimated 100,000 people and stirred unarmed peasants into open revolt.

The Vietnamese Communist leadership is fanatical, dedicated, and single-minded in pursuit of its aims. It regards its lengthy struggle as a unitary campaign embracing both the military and political, each of which must serve the interests of the other. Thus, when North Vietnam agreed to hold talks in Paris during 1968, it used politics to relieve military pressure on its defeated troops and to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, not to negotiate a compromise solution which would end the struggle. The late President Johnson failed to understand this.

Again, when Le Duc Tho made concessions to Dr. Kissinger in October, 1972, he did so to take the pressure off the retreating Communist troops. Later miscalculation by Hanoi resulted in the December, 1972, bombing, but that was halted by agreement to accept the draft cease-fire. Through the Paris settlement North Vietnam secured the withdrawal of America from Vietnam and the legal right to a military presence in South Vietnam. True, she agreed to withdraw her own troops from Laos and Cambodia and undertook not to engage in military aggression in the South, but these were merely tactical concessions of

the movement which she had no intention of observing in the longer term. As the world has seen, the Vietnamese Communists have violated every article of the Paris cease-fire, just as I said they would at the time of the signing.

No matter how the United States Congress may rationalize; no matter how Communist apologists in the free world may argue; no matter what conciliatory promises Hanoi or "Liberation" radio stations may broadcast, a Communist victory in South Vietnam would result in killings on a vast scale. The whole past record of the Communist leadership, the murder or abduction of 5,800 civilians in Hue during the 26-day occupation by Communists in 1968, the ceaseless references to "blood debts" which "must be paid," to the "guilt" of "tyrants" or "lackeys" made by the Communists over many years, the awful events which followed the 1954 Communist takeover in North Vietnam, and the testimony of those sent from North Vietnam to implement the takeover leave no room for doubt.

First, the Communists will require foreigners to depart and then, behind closed frontiers, they will eliminate every person, group and institution which they believe to pose a threat to their regime. Vengeance will be exacted from the "guilty," whose sin was to serve the legally constituted Government of South Vietnam or oppose the Communists at any level, local, provincial, or national. Should the bloodbath come about, it will be no excuse for those who did nothing to prevent it to say they did not know. All who argue that the Vietnamese Communists will exact no retribution are ignoring the abundant and irrefutable evidence. They are gambling their personal opinions against the lives of possibly a million South Vietnamese.

IMPATIENT, FAITHLESS AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a column by Russell Baker which I felt may be instructive as we consider a different direction in our approach to foreign policy. Today I want to introduce a second column by Mr. Baker which may have the same benefit:

IMPATIENT, FAITHLESS AMERICANS (By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON.—Henry, very important at the State Department, was weeping when I arrived for our interview. I withdrew discreetly, embarrassed by those powerful tears, but he pursued me. "Ask me why I am weeping," he commanded. I did.

"I am weeping because our allies will no longer have confidence in us," he said. "Vietnam proves that the United States is not a reliable ally because it will not do enough to help its friends."

"But, Henry, surely it proves just the opposite."

"Don't talk like an imbecile."

"We gave them 150 billion dollars, Henry. Was that an act of bad faith?"

"Not entirely," he said.

"We sent them an American Army of more than 500,000 men and lost 50,000 of our men in combat for them."

"An army fighting out there for them twice as long as we fought in World War II."

"Of course we did," Henry sobbed.

"And to support that Army we ran budget deficits that started us on the road to one of the worst inflations in our history, but

we were willing to do it because they were our allies and we wanted to stay reliable."

"That much was very decent of us," he agreed.

"We built and trained an army of their own for them and gave them guns, tanks, planes, cannon, trucks, helmets, rifles, bullets, khaki uniforms, metal helmets, and PX commissaries."

"Tell me something I don't know," said Henry.

"At home we let the country stew in bitterness, division and animosity as bad as anything we've had since the Civil War, and we let it happen because we were determined to honor our commitment."

"I'm not complaining about that."

"We had to throw out a President in order to keep faith with our Asian ally, but we did it."

"Lyndon Johnson," said Henry, "made a great sacrifice for the commitment."

"And then we elected Nixon to bring us together and give our Asian ally peace with honor, and we spent four years waiting for him to do it."

"It wasn't too much for an ally to expect of America," said Henry.

"To keep faith with our ally, we forced many young Americans to break from their families and live in exile, and even pursued them with policemen to punish them for not upholding America's reputation for reliability as an ally."

"That was then."

"We let other young Americans sit caged for years in North Vietnamese prisons, sometimes being tortured, and all to show that we would not break in our resolution to keep our commitment."

"Those were brave young men."

"We blockaded Haiphong harbor and bombed Hanoi, which cost us considerable losses in our Strategic Air Command bomber force. We moved peasants from their villages into armed camps to prevent their subversion by enemy forces. We defoliated large parts of the country, even though it brought us into bad repute among a lot of our other allies abroad, and we did it because we were resolute about honoring our commitment."

"Well?"

"We made war on a neutral country in violation of the Constitution, and we knew it was not a completely good thing to do, but we sat still for it because we were the kind of people who mean it when we say we will honor our commitments."

"I know all about Cambodia," said Henry, "but it has nothing to do with the present case."

"Be reasonable, Henry. You can't just shrug off the 150 billions, the longest war in American history; the 500,000 man American Army, the 50,000 dead and all that bombing, defoliating, and blockading. As good allies, we were willing to turn out a President, violate our own laws, and see our prisoners tortured, our families broken, our economy weakened, our world reputation damaged and our country deeply divided, rather than refuse to honor our commitment. Doesn't all that count for something, Henry?"

"Sure," sobbed Henry, "but what have we done for them lately?"

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support, as are a majority of

my respected colleagues, of legislation designed to expand and extend the existing child nutrition programs. Such programs are far too crucial to the health and well-being of America's youth to be allowed to succumb to the administration's proposal. As most of the Members of the House are aware, President Ford proposed replacing existing programs with a block grant consolidation; ending the general subsidy for lunches to some 15 million "nonneedy" children; and narrowing the eligibility for free or reduced-price school lunches.

I commend the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentlemen from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), for the speedy presentation of a school lunch program designed to bring a nutritious lunch to all the children of America—not just the very poor. Economic conditions today demand the establishment of programs with the specific goal of responding to the needs of the extremely hard-pressed middle-income families. As a result of this shift of emphasis—from a program which responded solely to the needs of the very poor, to one which responds to all of America's schoolchildren—we open and expand the program's support to include a much greater segment of our society. Therefore, the program which the committee offered to us last month is a stronger, more comprehensive proposal than the child nutrition programs of the past.

I am in complete agreement with the general thrust of the committee's proposal. Yet, certain inequities have come to light in the section of the legislation which requires the Federal Government to subsidize the difference between the maximum charge to students of 25 cents per lunch and the price of the school lunch as of January 1, 1975. The problems resulting from this proposal are as follows:

Schools which have operated inefficient and/or higher cost programs would be rewarded, because the Federal Government would pick up the tab for the difference between 25 cents and the price charged on January 1, 1975, with no limit on that subsidy.

Many local communities, such as my State of Hawaii, have set the price to the students of their school lunches lower than the cost, in effect, providing a local subsidy to insure low-cost nutrition to all of our children. These districts would be penalized for their initiative because the Federal payment is measured by the price of the lunch rather than the cost.

These inequities clearly are a result of funding based on price rather than on the actual cost of preparing a school lunch. By computing Federal payment according to this model we subsidize poor planning and punish efficiency.

In order to address this problem I have prepared an amendment which would alter the computation of Federal payment to the school districts, to base it on the average cost of preparing a lunch as of January 1, taking into account existing Federal payments and imposing a limit on the payment.

It is my belief that this proposal is one which can operate efficiently while not

exceeding the cost of the old proposal. The inequities found in the earlier amendment would be virtually eliminated in this proposal.

As was pointed out during the debate last month on H.R. 4222, my State of Hawaii has long been committed to providing a nutritious lunch to all schoolchildren. No one pays more than 25 cents right now, although cost pressures are mounting. We must fashion a program that deals fairly with those school districts, like Hawaii, where local initiative has made the school lunch program a major part of the educational experience.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize how much is at stake in this debate. Not only must we shape a viable framework for continuing the school lunch program, but the other nutrition programs contained in this measure must also be attended to. The WIC program—women, infants, and children—has met with major success in Hawaii and elsewhere around the country; it needs to be extended. The school breakfast and summer feeding programs have filled important gaps in nutritional programs.

I commend the Education and Labor Committee for its continued hard work toward achieving agreement on a national compromise measure which the House can approve expeditiously. I pledge my fullest personal cooperation in that effort.

Only America's schoolchildren can lose if this vital legislation, with the proposed amendments, is not quickly approved.

CABLE TELEVISION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert correspondence between me and Mr. Ackerman of Becker Communications Associates concerning cable television:

APRIL 1, 1975.

Mr. JAMES F. ACKERMAN,
Executive Director, Becker Communications
Associates, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. ACKERMAN: With your implied permission, I am inserting your letter in the appendix of the Congressional Record. It is informative and, for the most part, persuasive.

I confess that I do not grasp fully the relevant arguments in terms of expansion or restriction of cable television in its competition with broadcasting. But your letter certainly is an element which contributes to my knowledge of the field.

Best,

ANDY JACOBS, Jr.

BECKER COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATES,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 19, 1975.
Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: The purpose of this letter is to call to your attention the fact that cable television, an infant industry of much promise, is being crucified by its competitors, and that the FCC, a federal

agency created by Congress, has been an active and knowing accomplice to this crime.

I have been acting as a lender and financial consultant to the CATV industry for nearly 16 years. Over the years I have worked with approximately 20% of the CATV systems in the nation. In addition, I am also an active investor in several systems.

To date, the American people have clearly demonstrated that they desire the benefits of cable. In fact, nearly 15% of the nation's households now subscribe. While there has never been a documented case of a broadcaster suffering because of cable, the FCC has continually promulgated rules and decisions which are designed solely to protect vested broadcasting interests from any and all conceivable competition from cable. Unfortunately, the FCC's actions are preventing the remainder of the American people from enjoying the benefits of cable.

The FCC's actions are slowly strangling this promising infant industry.

Bear with me while I detail several examples of the FCC's version of "justice":

(A) I own a cable system which serves over half the population of Connersville, Indiana. The small town of Brookville (2900 population), which lies 20 miles to the south of Connersville, had requested that we serve them, thereby enabling them to view local Indiana television stations from Indianapolis.

Unfortunately, under the FCC's regulations, a small portion of Brookville lies within the mythical "35-mile zone" of Cincinnati, Ohio. This has the drastic effect of doubling the cost of installing such system, while at the same time limiting the number of signals that can be carried. The net effect is that the residents of Brookville—people who want and should have cable—could not be economically served.

Reacting to the illogic of the rules, we petitioned the FCC for a waiver which would have allowed us to install a normal system and to carry off-the-air Indianapolis signals. As could be expected, the FCC denied our request because a broadcaster in Cincinnati filed a protest. Unfortunately, the real "losers" are the people of Brookville who will not have the cable service they requested.

(B) I serve as Executive Director of Becker Communications Associates, a \$35 million fund devoted to CATV and communication investments. We are financing a CATV company which will serve areas immediately contiguous to Fort Wayne, Indiana. Under the FCC's rules, it was unclear whether the company would be entitled to import WGN from Chicago or an alternative station from Detroit. The company was willing to expend considerable sums of money to import either channel by microwave, but it would be clearly impractical for it to expend huge amounts necessary to import both.

With customary wisdom, the FCC in a Solomon-like manner, "split the baby" and allowed the company to utilize Detroit signals in one-half of its system and WGN from Chicago in the other half. The FCC had been informed that this was clearly impractical, but that had no effect. Again, the people will be the only real "losers."

(C) A current rulemaking before the FCC could deal a death blow to the cable industry. Specifically, the FCC is considering ordering the deletion of distant sports programming from cable. Since this is one of the great attractions of cable, as well as all television, the cable industry would be decimated by such a rule. Again, the public is the "loser."

(D) One final example, the White House Office of Telecommunication, and Justice Department and the National Cable Television Association have all called upon the FCC to "deregulate" cable so that the nation might reap the benefits of this communications

resource. Here, again, the FCC has dragged its feet, and any action it finally does take will clearly be "too little too late".

The above are just a few of the many examples I could cite which demonstrate that the FCC's actions are severely limiting cable's growth and may, in fact, be destroying this infant industry.

I sincerely solicit your help in informing your colleagues in Congress of the damage being perpetrated by the FCC under the guise of the Congressional authorization found in the Communications Act of 1934.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but I feel that our elected representatives must know what is taking place at the FCC. We are in constant touch with the FCC and are spending thousands of dollars every month with our attorneys. Frankly, we aren't making much progress.

I don't know what the answer is but I am hopeful that my representative—as well as the representative of the people in the cable areas—you might communicate your concerns to the FCC Commissioners, who I believe, are serving the interests of the broadcasters rather than the interests of the people.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at (317) 923-2353.

Sincerely,

JAMES F. ACKERMAN,
Executive Director.

THE BLACK ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, recently commented on that organization's quarterly economic report on the black worker.

The report estimates that true black unemployment—including those out of work, working part time when they want full-time work, and those who have given up trying to find jobs—but are not counted in the Government's unemployment statistics—is about 25 percent.

As Mr. Jordan points out, there are as many blacks out of work today as in the worst days of the Great Depression. He also observes that "high white unemployment is also hidden by the official numbers game. In addition to the 6.9 million white workers officially counted as unemployed in February, add another 6.9 million discouraged workers, and people in part-time jobs who want full-time work."

I enclose in the RECORD Mr. Jordan's statement which concludes that the Nation is indeed in a real depression and it is time to "get to the business of ending it."

The statement follows:

THE BLACK ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

(By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.)

Statisticians have discovered a remarkable way to move people in and out of the labor force. They call it "seasonal adjustment." And one way to make the unemployment figures lower is not to count people unemployed if they've given up looking for work in a job market where no employment opportunities exist.

The Labor Department's February unemployment figures showed a rate of 8.2 percent, or about 7.5 million people out of work. Those are seasonally adjusted figures, theoretical constructs to account for shifts in work patterns that occur from month to month.

But when real people are counted—bodies, not theoretical constructs—the picture changes somewhat. Then we have an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent and 8.3 million workers—real people with bills to pay and families to feed—out of work.

And even these figures are grossly misleading. In February, some 580,000 workers gave up looking for jobs. So long as they registered each week that they were actively looking for work, they were counted as unemployed. In February, after weeks of fruitless job-hunting and no leads or interview possibilities they gave up the search. They thus became, in the official statistics, non-persons, no longer part of the labor force and no longer counted as unemployed.

Seen from the vantage point of a person who wants to work in a society that has no work for him, these statistical exercises become a sort of shell-game deceiving the public, legislators and the Administration about the seriousness of the Depression.

I'm not calling it a recession any more, because we are currently living through an economic Depression. For black people, there isn't the faintest doubt about this.

One of the biggest barriers to getting the kind of federal action to end this Depression is the public's ignorance of the seriousness of the situation. The National Urban League's Research Department just released its quarterly economic report on the black worker, and, along with up-dating to cover the last month or so, it presents a devastating picture of the black economic Depression.

It estimates true black employment including those out of work, working part-time when they want full-time work, and those who have given up trying to find jobs, at about 25 percent, one out of every four black workers!

For black teenagers, the official rate is over 40 percent. In some urban ghettos, up to half the people are without full-time jobs they want.

And that's not all. There are as many blacks out of work today as in the darkest days of the Great Depression. About a quarter of the black unemployed have been out of work for at least four months. About 700,000 of the black unemployed are not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, because their unemployment did not result from direct job lay-offs, a requirement for such benefits.

And one striking finding is that blacks, who comprise 12 percent of local government employees, make up almost of all local government workers who were unemployed, offering striking testimony to the disproportionate lay-offs of blacks by local governments, demonstrating lessened commitment to affirmative action.

Some people, noticing the concentration of black workers in the laggard auto industry, think that alone accounts for high black jobless rates. Not true. Far more blacks have lost jobs in the construction and food processing industries.

And this Depression is not confined to blacks, it cuts across the board. High white unemployment is also hidden by the official numbers game. In addition to the 6.9 million white workers officially counted as unemployed in February, add another 6.9 million discouraged workers, and people in part-time jobs who want full-time work and you've got a grand total of close to 14 million white people out of work today.

No amount of fudging can hide the fact that this nation is in a real Depression. It's time to stop haggling over what to call it and get to the business of ending it.

GUIDELINES FOR CLAIMING TAX CREDIT FOR PURCHASE OF NEW RESIDENCE UNDER THE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1975

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to aid my constituents in their understanding of the provisions of the tax credit for the purchase of newly constructed housing under the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, I am inserting the recently released Internal Revenue Service's guidelines for claiming the credit: TECHNICAL INFORMATION RELEASE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Guidelines for claiming the credit for purchase of a new principal residence under the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 were announced today by the Internal Revenue Service. Taxpayers may rely upon the guidelines pending issuance of regulations.

Section 208 of the Act, new Internal Revenue Code section 44, provides a Federal income tax credit of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted basis with respect to a new principal residence purchased or constructed by the taxpayer, if it is constructed, acquired, and occupied within specified periods. The maximum credit is \$2,000 (\$1,000 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return), and the credit may not exceed the amount of the taxpayer's tax liability.

To qualify for the credit the following conditions must be met:

- (1) The residence must be a new principal residence,
- (2) The construction must have begun before March 26, 1975.
- (3) The residence must be acquired and occupied as a principal residence after March 12, 1975 and before January 1, 1977.
- (4) Except in the case of self-construction, a binding contract for the purchase of the residence must be entered into before January 1, 1976, and
- (5) Except in the case of self-construction, the buyer must attach to his return a certification by the seller that the purchase price is the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

The property purchased must be a new principal residence of the taxpayer, the original use of which commences with the taxpayer. The term "principal residence" refers to the place where the taxpayer lives most of the year and has the same meaning as under section 1034 of the Code. The term "residence" includes a single family structure, a residential unit in a condominium or cooperative housing project, the taxpayer's portion of a duplex or a row house, and a mobile home. The residence must be new. A renovated building does not qualify as new for this purpose, regardless of the extent of the renovation. The "original use" of the new principal residence by the taxpayer means that such residence has never been lived in prior to acquisition by the taxpayer. For these purposes, a residence will be treated as never having been lived in prior to acquisition if the first occupancy was by the taxpayer pursuant to a lease arrangement pending settlement under a binding contract to purchase or pursuant to a lease arrangement where a written option to purchase was contained in the original lease agreement.

The credit applies only to a new principal residence the construction of which began before March 26, 1975. For this purpose, construction is considered to commence when actual physical work of a significant amount has occurred at the building site. A significant amount of construction requires more

than drilling to determine soil conditions, preparation of an architect's sketches, securing of a building permit, or grading of the land. However, digging of the footings, excavation of the building site, or similar work constitute a significant amount of construction.

Construction of a mobile home or a factory-built house is considered to commence when construction of important parts of the mobile home or factory-built house commenced. Construction or assembly of a minor portion of the components of the mobile home or factory-built house does not constitute commencement of construction.

The credit applies only to property acquired and occupied as a principal residence by the taxpayer after March 12, 1975, and before January 1, 1977. However, where the residence is acquired by purchase rather than self-construction, it must also have been acquired by the taxpayer under a binding contract entered into before January 1, 1976. For these purposes, a taxpayer has "acquired" a residence when legal title to it is conveyed to him at settlement, or he has possession of it pursuant to a binding purchase contract under which he makes periodic payments until he becomes entitled under the contract to demand conveyance of title. The credit may not be claimed until both the acquisition and occupancy tests have been satisfied. Thus, where a taxpayer meets the acquisition test set forth above after March 12, 1975, and occupies the property as a new principal residence before January 1, 1976, the credit is allowed on the taxpayer's 1975 tax return. Thus, a taxpayer may be entitled to the credit with respect to a residence where a purchase contract was entered into prior to March 13, 1975, so long as settlement and occupancy occur after March 12, 1975.

Taxpayers claiming the credit should attach new IRS Form 5405 to their tax return on which the credit is claimed. An announcement will be made when the form is available. Except in the case of self-construction, taxpayers must also attach a certification by the seller that the purchase price is the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

The following form of the certification statement will be accepted:

I certify that the construction of the residence at (specify address) was begun before March 26, 1975, and that this residence has never been offered for sale in a listing, a written private offer, or an offer by means of advertisement at a lower purchase price than (state price), the price at which I sold the residence to (state name, present address, and social security number of purchaser) by contract dated (give date).

(Date, seller's signature and taxpayer identification number.)

An offer to sell is limited to a listing, a written private offer or an offer by means of advertisement to sell a specified residence at a specified purchase price.

In determining whether a residence was sold at the lowest purchase price ever offered, appropriate adjustment shall be made for differences in financing terms and closing costs which increase the seller's actual net proceeds and the purchaser's actual cost. Where the sale to the taxpayer includes property which was not the subject of the prior offer or excludes property which was included in the prior offer, the amount of the prior offer shall be adjusted to reflect the fair market value of such property, provided that the taxpayer had the option to require inclusion or exclusion of such property included in the sale. The fair market value of any excluded property is to be determined at the time of the prior offer, while all additions are to be valued at their fair market value on the date of execution of the contract of sale.

The adjusted basis of the new principal residence on which the credit is computed

includes all amounts which are attributable to the acquisition or construction of the taxpayer's new principal residence, but only to the extent that such amounts constitute capital expenditures and are not allowable as deductions in computing taxable income. The adjusted basis is reduced by any gain from the sale of an old principal residence, which is not recognized due to the application of section 1033 or section 1034. Thus, if a taxpayer sells an old principal residence for \$30,000 which has an adjusted basis of \$20,000 and reinvests the proceeds by purchasing a new principal residence for \$40,000 (including settlement costs which are capital in nature) and this purchase satisfies the statutory criteria under section 1034 for non-recognition of gain, then the credit would apply with respect to \$30,000 of the cost of the new principal residence. The credit allowable under this section does not in any way affect the taxpayer's basis in his new principal residence.

The Tax Reduction Act also increased the replacement periods provided in section 1034 from 1 year to 18 months in the case of purchase and from 18 months to 2 years in the case of self-construction. This provision applies to old residences sold or exchanged after December 31, 1974.

Where self-construction of a principal residence was begun before March 13, 1975, only that portion of the basis of the property allocable to construction after March 12, 1975 and before January 1, 1977, shall be taken into consideration in determining the amount of the credit allowable. Thus, if prior to March 13, 1975, a taxpayer who qualifies for the credit has constructed a portion of a residence at a cost of \$10,000 and the total cost of the residence is \$40,000, \$30,000 will be subject to the credit.

Where a new principal residence is purchased by more than one taxpayer other than a husband and wife, the amount of the credit allowed will be allocated among the taxpayers in proportion to their respective ownership interests in such residence, with the limitation that the sum of the credits allowed to all such taxpayers shall not exceed \$2,000. For this purpose, joint tenants with right of survivorship are treated as equal owners.

The credit is allowed with respect to only one residence of the taxpayer. In addition, the credit is not available for purchases from certain persons related to the taxpayer. Such related persons include the taxpayer's spouse, ancestors and lineal descendants and certain related corporations, partnerships and trusts described in section 267 and 707(b) of the Code.

The Act also provides for recapture in the event of a sale or other disposition of the residence within a 36-month period with exceptions for reinvestment in a new principal residence and for certain involuntary dispositions.

Civil penalties and criminal fines and imprisonment could result from false certification by a seller. If it is found that the price for which the residence was sold is not in fact the lowest price for which the residence was ever offered for sale, then the statute provides that a seller who certified that it was, is liable to the purchaser for damages in an amount equal to three times the excess over the lowest purchase price plus reasonable attorney's fees. No income tax deduction is allowed to the seller for two-thirds of any damages paid or incurred pursuant to a judgment entered against him in a suit brought by a purchaser on this issue. An individual who falsely certifies is liable for criminal penalties such as those under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

In the absence of the taxpayer's participation in, or knowledge of, a false certification by the seller, the credit is not denied to a taxpayer who otherwise qualifies for the

credit solely because the seller has falsely certified that the new principal residence was sold at the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

FOOD DAY AND WORLD HUNGER YEAR

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, April 17 was World Food Day. It was a day during which many organizations throughout the world are highlighting the world's food shortage to those who can do something about it. Many of my colleagues in the House are participating in or benefiting from some of the Food Day activities taking place in Washington. I would like to commemorate this day by introducing to the Members of the House of Representatives an organization devoted to ending starvation at home and throughout the world. The organization, of which I am privileged to be a trustee, is called World Hunger Year, or WHY.

Already the dedicated people who comprise WHY have taken the initiative in making us aware of the extent of the food crisis. Last month I met with members of WHY here in Washington. Their purpose was to learn from us what can be done legislatively to ease the food shortages. I was pleased that my colleagues Representatives PAT SCHROEDER, PETER PEYSER, and PAUL SIMON were able to join me in my discussions. We, and staff representatives from other congressional offices and committees discussed pending legislative approaches as well as what might be done in the future. We were also able to provide the people from WHY with specific information about existing Federal programs so that they can publicize these efforts, thereby heightening the general public's awareness and concern for world hunger.

Our meeting with WHY generated significant interest among many people on the Hill, and I would like to take this opportunity to encourage that interest. Therefore, at the conclusion of my remarks I insert WHY's statement of purpose, along with its address and telephone numbers, in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues and others who are interested in aiding WHY in its work to contact them soon. The food problem is one that requires the creative and energetic talents that World Hunger Year has already so amply demonstrated. WHY deserves our personal and legislative support.

The statement follows:

WHY—WORLD HUNGER YEAR

P.O. Box 1975, Garden City, N.Y.

Tel.: (516) 742-3700; (212) 986-9676

WHY is a non-profit corporation devoted to ending starvation at home and throughout the world. WHY believes that:

It is unconscionable that anyone should starve or even be hungry in a world which can feed them.

The inequities stemming from an unjust distribution of the world's food have deep

seated causes not easily solved by charity, and therefore we must treat the causes as well as the symptoms.

A basic change in human values is a necessary step toward achieving our goal, and grass roots educational efforts are an important means to begin that change.

A basic change in governmental priorities is necessary to implement a just end to starvation. The political, economic and logistical realities that exist in some of the most affected areas of the globe seriously limit much of the impact of well-intended aid.

Everyone is in a position to contribute to the final solution. Working together the people of the world can have a significant impact on the basic policy decisions that will decide whether millions of people will eat or not.

Our country's present efforts to relieve the economic problems and the hunger that exist in the United States are not incompatible with tackling the world hunger situation, and indeed, working on one demands working on both.

JOANNA MARIE BURLEY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, 14-year-old Joanna Marie Burley, of Cumberland, lay paralyzed after a knife attack on her way home from school. At that time physicians at West Virginia University Medical Center informed her parents that she would never walk again.

But Joanna was no ordinary girl and she refused to accept the fate outlined for her. Displaying unusual courage in the face of adversity Joanna has slowly conquered her paralysis and today, with effort and determination, she can take some steps without the aid of crutches.

This story of hope and courage was recently reported in a feature story that ran in the Cumberland News-Times and I would like to submit it now for the RECORD.

JOANNA BURLEY, PARALYZED AFTER KNIFE ATTACK, TO WALK AS RESULT OF MEDICAL MIRACLE, HOPE

(By J. Suter Kegg)

When the Maryland State Police hold their dance next month at Clarysville Inn, all ears will be on Ronnie Dove, the country western-pop star from Nashville, Tenn. via Baltimore. But the eyes of the sellout attendance will be on a "walking dream."

Fourteen-year-old Joanna Marie Burley, a girl whose destiny four-and-a-half years ago was considered as bleak as an Arctic winter, will occupy a "seat of honor" at the annual frolic of Mountain Lodge 40, Fraternal Order of Police. If she so desires, the attractive blonde, blue-eyed South End girl will even stand—without the aid of crutches.

In April of 1971 such an undertaking would have been impossible. In fact, doctors at that time held little hope for her ever again standing alone.

As a vivacious youngster of 10, Joanna was struck down by a knife-wielding assailant enroute from Pennsylvania Avenue School to her home at 219 Memorial Avenue. The unprovoked attack by a youth who lay in hiding occurred November 10, 1970, the wedding anniversary of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Chauncey Burley.

Paralyzed from the hips down as a result of the spinal slashing, Joanna was treated at

Memorial Hospital, then rushed to the West Virginia University Medical Center at Morgantown for emergency surgery. It was there that her parents received the cruel prognosis—"Your daughter will never be able to walk again!"

Joanna herself, displaying a story-book type of courage, refused to accept the fate predicted for her. Arrangements were made to have her admitted to Children's Hospital in Baltimore, a veritable "house of Miracles." There she was fitted with braces from her waist to her toes and the long, torturous road to recovery began.

While progress has been slow, the plucky youngster never gave up hope, nor did she refuse to smile in the face of adversity. Under the faithful supervision and insistence of her mother, Stella, Joanna regularly went through prescribed therapeutic exercises at home. In addition, she received periodic treatments at the Allegany County League for Crippled Children and even enrolled in Red Cross swimming classes conducted at Allegany Community College by Lawrence Brehm.

Little by little, improvement in her condition was noted. She regained some movement in the lower part of her body and gradually need of the full, cumbersome braces diminished.

Last July 11, Dr. George O. Eaton, the celebrated Baltimore neurosurgeon, operated on her at Children's Hospital. A sliver of bone was removed from her right hip and fused onto the back of her right heel, forming a wedge. This is expected to compensate for a "drop" in that foot.

She remained in the hospital for a month and has worn three different types of braces. The only one she wears now extends only from the calf of her right leg to the foot and there's a strong possibility Dr. Eaton will order that one removed when he visits the League for Crippled Children here next month.

"I might even be able to wear almost any kind of shoes again," Joanna says wistfully. "After almost five years, I'm tired of saddle shoes."

Unable to attend ninth-grade classes at Fort Hill High School during her recovery, Joanna received private tutoring from the Board of Education at her home. She completed her year's studies April 1, her final report card showing two A's, a C-plus and a B.

When she re-enters Fort Hill next September as a sophomore, Joanna expects to be without any type of brace. She will, however, be required to use crutches for balance.

There is still some paralysis in the right leg from her hip to her knee but she can, with effort and determination, take a few steps without crutches.

Dr. Eaton, who smiles with pride every time he examines Joanna, wants her to practice these unaccompanied steps daily.

And Dr. Victor Weiss, the neurosurgeon who first operated on her at West Virginia Medical Center and since has established a practice at Memorial Hospital, regards the progress Joanna has made as "little short of a miracle."

The same goes for State and City Police who adopted Joanna as their symbolic sweetheart following her misfortune in 1970. She was four-feet-seven then and was confined to a wheelchair. Today, she's an attractive five-foot-four young lady who is extremely grateful to be able to stand on her "own two feet."

Detective Sgt. Bernard Chabot of the Cumberland Barracks of the State Police regards the scheduled appearance of Joanna as a bonus for guests at the May 24 dance. Sgt. Chabot is chairman of the committee on arrangements. Other members are Troopers Lester Lewis, Donald Malers and Martin Tichnell.

HATCH ACT REVISION SUPPORTED

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, the Subcommittee on Employee Political Rights and Intergovernmental Programs of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee held a special evening public hearing on H.R. 3000, a bill with 57 cosponsors which will significantly revise the Hatch Act to allow Federal and postal employees to more actively participate in political activities as private citizens. Members of the subcommittee heard 24 witnesses—primarily Federal employees—who overwhelmingly supported passage of this bill. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3000, I want to share with my colleagues a statement by a Federal employee and one of my constituents, Mr. Arlof D. Hewson:

STATEMENT OF ARLOF D. HEWSON ON
H.R. 3000

I am Arlof D. Hewson (Pete) from Springfield in Fairfax County Virginia. I am an Operations Research Analyst, in the competitive civil service, for the Department of the Army working at the Pentagon, where I have been employed for over four years. I am also fortunate to be associated with Common Cause, currently as 8th District Membership Coordinator and formerly as Campaign Coordinator between 1972 and 1974. Consequently, I have participated in a variety of both Federal, State and Local political campaigns on a non-partisan basis as well as having been in contact with much of the Northern Virginia electorate in both the 8th and 10th Congressional Districts.

During the course of my varied activities with Common Cause, I became concerned about the number of federal civil servants and military personnel who felt they could not participate in any political activity, even non-partisan political activity such as work for Common Cause, because of the federal government regulations. I would like to note that I am here to express my own opinion and not a Common Cause position, but I have been encouraged to testify as an individual. It is the basic Common Cause position to ensure maximum political participation for all citizens at every level in the political process. (Ref 1)

I would like to express my appreciation to my 8th District Congressman, Herb Harris, and his staff for informing me of the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee. We in civil service and particularly in my district, are particularly pleased about Congressman Harris' participation on this Committee of Congress, so vital to federal employees' interests. I have also reviewed the January Common Cause Newsletter (Ref 2) to see the 1974 survey responses for those members of this Subcommittee as well as H.R. 3000 Cosponsors, and want to thank those present who have consistently supported Common Cause stands on open government and citizen participatory action.

I am here to endorse H.R. 3000, the "Federal Employees' Political Act of 1975". After carefully studying the draft legislation, I feel that the passage of this bill would greatly increase federal employee participation in our democratic election process without abusing employee protection from those few high governmental officials who might consider forcing or coercing us to perform political activities against our individual wishes. I would like to add that I personally have never witnessed any such abuses in the De-

partment of the Army or in the Department of Defense and in fact have never heard of such abuses, and I am most thankful for this. Any concerns about this act on the part of my cohorts was only limited to its potential abuse and I cannot see any more possibility of this under H.R. 3000 than under the provisions of the "Hatch Act".

I believe that the non-participation of a large number of federal employees in the political process seriously erodes the capabilities of our State and Local government. In a recently published book "The Border South States" by Mr. N. Peirce, he notes in the chapter on Virginia (Ref 3) "Many of the most skilled residents of Northern Virginia work for the Federal Government and were prohibited by the 'Hatch Act' from taking part in any political activity".

While this is an erroneous statement since some political activity is authorized, it indicates that even some political writers do not understand the ramifications of the current law. Mr. Peirce goes on to say that No. Virginia has the lowest percentage of voters despite having the highest education level of any area in the state. This is true according to the U.S. Census of 1970 and is reflected by the total votes cast per district in the 1973 state gubernatorial election (Ref. 4).

The 8th District cast the least (approx. 46.5%) and the 10th cast the next fewest (approx. 48%). I would like to further note that Fairfax County, the fastest growing and best educated of any county in the Commonwealth, cast a relatively low vote (approx. 50%) in the 1974 Congressional elections compared to the rest of Virginia's districts, even though we had highly spirited and potentially close races. I believe this was caused by misapprehension over the "Hatch Act" although it was also caused by some higher transience in our population.

The major improvement I desire would be for additional federal legislation (but not in this bill) to provide equivalent broad political rights for military personnel. Many military persons as well as many civil service employees express their desire to further participate in the political processes but are certain that all activity is prohibited. In my opinion, the loss to the system of so many governmentally sophisticated individuals in the No. Virginia area has denied us meaningful political access, especially at the State level. For example, many military and civil service personnel bus or car pool to the Pentagon area over antiquated transportation networks, but primarily because of our lack of political status, we are unable to make our needs felt—namely to secure additional state funds to improve public transport and better highways/rail lines.

In a few instances, I have met superior federal employees, those with exceptional backgrounds and leadership capabilities, who should be encouraged to run as a candidate for office in one of the many of our elections. In every case they were discouraged because they could only run as an Independent. While Virginia is noted for a few Independent elected officials, the normal path for political success is through either political party and their caucuses. If this bill is passed, the impediment of not being able to participate in a party leadership position would be eliminated, and expertise, leadership and additional viewpoints would be added to the local Democratic and Republican party organizations.

In conclusion, I feel that the passage of H.R. 3000 will be a tremendous asset to the federal civilian employees as well as to Northern Virginia. I would anticipate its passage would increase the 8th and 10th Districts' voter participation by the thousands and political activists by the hundreds, which in my opinion will be beneficial to our area. I believe neither the Democratic nor Republican Party nor liberal/conservative ideology will gain particular advantage

from this since federal employees in our area appear fairly equally divided politically. I further hope that some day soon I will be able to testify in behalf of state public employees on Virginia legislation as far sighted as this bill. I appreciate your attention and will respond to any questions that the Members of the Subcommittee may care to ask.

BEAVER DAM DAILY CITIZEN ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, with the end to hostilities in Cambodia, and the daily deterioration of the strength of the South Vietnamese Government signaling the impending fall of that government, it is perhaps appropriate at this time that we take a broad view of what this final chapter to American involvement in Southeast Asia means.

For those of us who have felt that the conflicts in Cambodia and Vietnam were wars between local nationals fighting for control of their own countries, it is appropriate that these people finally be permitted to choose their own destiny without the great powers using them as pawns on a worldwide chessboard.

John Heilman, writing in the Beaver Dam, Wis., Daily Citizen, has offered a perceptive and thoughtful editorial on the meaning of our involvement in Southeast Asia and the positive value we still may gain from this tragic experience. I commend his comments to the attention of my colleagues:

FOR THE RECORD

(By John Heilman)

With the impending fall of South Vietnam, there are still some who sit and wonder what is going to happen next. These seem to include both President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger, judging from statements regarding the domino theory in past weeks.

However, with recent developments, such as the bombing of the presidential palace, they may have some reason to change their minds. Still it is incomprehensible that anyone who has followed the war, especially the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, even in the most token gesture can hold such outmoded concepts to be of any value.

It seems almost poetic justice, that the fall coincides with the death of the staunch anti-communist leader Chiang Kai-shek, ally in World War II. What has happened and will eventually, when the whole of South East Asia, at least Vietnam and with all probability Cambodia, goes is only what has been expected since the war started turning sour in the late sixties. What has really come to end is the great era of Western Imperialism, which started in the 19th century. It is difficult to realize the dominance of the West over Asia has taken nearly one hundred fifty years, and countless lives of both segments of the world to work itself out.

It is even harder to realize in spite of two major world conflicts, the change in the entire political structure of the nations of the world during that time, the age old ideas of fear and nationalism are still treated as valid. What many fail to see in retrospect, is

the entire conflict in the Far East has not really been the result of communist vs. free, but rather the question of local nationals to control and retain the right over their existence. In many respects this is what started in China when Mao was able to oust Chiang, and has been perpetuated in Vietnam. For years now, experts have been saying the moribund notion of communism has been a fabrication of the Western mind.

The communist nations of the world are just as much at odds with each other as have been the Western ones. The attitudes of the people, from those who refused to support the nationalist government in China to those who could not find anything but apathy for the South Vietnamese, were simply indicating they didn't want Western domination, and were really politically indifferent. A thought very difficult for the politically minded Westerner to understand. Still, with the moment of truth at hand, there has to be some reflection on the events of the past two and a half decades, and the course which lies ahead.

There has to be one sound realization, that Western influence, American or otherwise, in Asia has come to an end. The great strongholds of Western integrity are gone. Chiang is dead, and regardless what some analysts might say, there is evidence his son will find negotiations with the mainland less distasteful than did his father. There is strong indication there may be a reunification, or at least a decline in hostilities between the two factions. This is equally true of the position of South East Asia. With the Western influence defunct, there again is strong reason to believe there may be solidification in that part of the globe. However, there are still the major national differences, and there is no doubt still the attitude of the leaders of various national groups not to want to be under the thumb of anyone.

It is difficult to find a veteran now who feels the war was worth it, or even felt that way over there. The bombs dropped on nowhere, shells fired into empty forests, attacks on unheld ground, as well as taking ground at heavy cost, only to lose it. These are things the Americans will have to live with for some time to come. They are tragic memories, but they may well begin a new era in not just U.S. foreign policy, but world policy as well. It may well be the age of unilateral strength is at an end, that no single power, or group of powers can play 19th century games. If that much is gained, if it took the Vietnamese disaster to learn it, there may be some hope all was not wasted.

EFFECTIVE HOME HEALTH CARE IN MINNEAPOLIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last month my colleague, Mr. STEELMAN, and I, along with 49 cosponsors, introduced legislation dealing with a significant, yet badly neglected aspect of a well-balanced comprehensive health care system—home health care.

At that time, we pointed out that though home health care is not intended to be a substitute for institutional care when institutional care is needed, home care offers in many instances a less expensive and more effective alternative to institutionalization.

Our bills, as well as legislation introduced by my colleague, Mr. CONABLE,

providing for an optional program of long-term health care services within medicare, are bills worthy of serious consideration. The Conable bill, H.R. 2268, encompasses homemaker services, nutrition services such as meals on wheels, long-term institutional care services, day-care and foster home services, community mental health center outpatient services, as well as home health care services.

I was pleased that last week the House overwhelmingly approved H.R. 3922, the Older Americans Act Amendments, which contained a new title providing funds to public and private nonprofit agencies which agree to provide home health care and other home services to senior citizens.

In my home district of Minneapolis, dramatic savings to taxpayers are achieved daily by the Minneapolis Age and Opportunity Center, a nonprofit home health care organization, which, under the outstanding leadership of Ms. Daphne Krause, makes it possible for senior citizens to retain relative independence by remaining in the familiar surrounding of their own homes.

An interesting article on the age and opportunity center appears in the April issue of Family Circle magazine. It is a well-presented case for the need for home health care services and a good description of how home health care works:

AGED PARENTS AND DEPENDENT KIDS: THE MIDDLE-AGED DILEMMA

(NOTE.—In the seventh of its reports on "Today's Families and Their Money Problems," Family Circle tells how a unique, comprehensive agency serving the aged helped relieve the dilemma of a Minneapolis family with elderly parents who were no longer able to take care of themselves.)

When their doctor told Marie and Frank Butler that they would have to go to a nursing home, their daughter-in-law Joan spent a frantic day phoning almost every nursing home in Minneapolis. The doctor felt that Marie, 71 and suffering from diabetes, and Frank, 75, chair-ridden with emphysema, no longer could take care of themselves in their own home.

Joan found what she and her husband, Dick, considered to be a suitable nursing home—one run by a local church group.

Marie and Frank stayed less than three months and insisted on going home. After 45 years of their own apartments and then a house, they couldn't stand being limited to one room—one not even as big as just their living room at home. Moreover, proud people who survived the Depression of the 1930's, when Frank worked 78 hours a week for \$22 as a butcher, they rejected the prospect that after they consumed most of their assets they would have to ask for state aid to pay the nursing home. Even that short stay cost Marie and Frank \$3,000—a heartbreaking chunk of their life savings.

Marie is a sweet-faced lady with a gentle voice. Even when she tells her troubles she sounds as though she's explaining rather than complaining. "The care at the nursing home was wonderful," she relates. "But they put us in the infirmary. The people there were all senile. It was very expensive; \$1,215 a month for the two of us. They tell you to borrow on your insurance and turn over your house. They allow you to keep only \$750 in savings. Then you can go on relief. I haven't been on relief my whole life. I don't intend to go now."

If they had remained in the nursing home, state aid was inevitable. Their total income

is only \$360 a month, mostly Social Security and a pension from the Meat Cutters Union. Their prized house itself, an elderly frame dwelling in a downtown block of two- and four-family houses, might also have to be sold.

For Dick and Joan, their parents' refusal to remain in the nursing home created a guilt-edged dilemma that confronts most middle-aged and even youngish couples sooner or later. Having elderly parents remain in their own home or even in yours is no problem when they're physically capable. But caring for an invalid is another matter. The problem often occurs just when sons and daughters are collecting their own crises, including health difficulties and the needs of growing children.

Despite modern financial helps such as Medicare and state medical aid, the quandary of how to care for older parents is increasing. For one thing, average life expectancy is increasing—no society in history has had to care for such a large elderly population.

Another reason for the spreading concern over care of the elderly is that the proliferation of nursing homes, some launched to soak up increased government funds, has been matched by the increasing number of horror stories about their inadequate care.

When elderly people must enter a nursing home, adding to the inevitable guilt feelings of their relatives is the worry about the quality of care. Only about 20 percent of nursing homes are truly high quality, Senate experts say.

The basic puzzle is, where does an elderly person go? One study found that many who enter nursing homes do so not for unarguable medical reasons but because they simply have no other place to go. Over half of those now in nursing homes really need only some help in their activities.

The dilemma of care for the elderly inevitably has an emotional impact on their grown children. Relations between husband and wife are affected because of the financial help one spouse may give to an elderly parent, especially when it's without consulting the other. The needs of elderly parents also may cause discord among their sons and daughters by recalling old rivalries and jealousies. A common phenomenon is the resentment of those who help toward those who don't want to help.

Joan and Dick Butler themselves felt some of those concerns when Marie and Frank insisted on leaving the nursing home. Dick is 50—a big, patient man and a skilled machinist employed at the Honeywell factory in Minneapolis most of his work life. But he suffers from histaminic headaches which have affected his eyes. He had to leave work for seven weeks last fall with his only income from workmen's compensation.

Joan is a tall, lean woman with strong features and a ready smile who dresses in tailored, well-organized separates and runs a tidy, well-organized home. She's able to keep glued together despite the many demands she's had to meet in the course of raising seven children. There has never been any discord between her and Dick over what help they gave his parents, usually more in the way of services—such as doing their laundry—than in cash. In fact, Marie Butler told me she thinks of Joan and her own daughter-in-law, Molly, as her own daughters.

But as is often the case, one son or daughter usually assumes a major role in helping elderly parents. Sometimes it's the one living closest or who left home last. Dick's brother, Bill, two years older, moved to Texas and can no longer help.

Working couples like Joan and Dick rarely have the capacity to aid elderly relatives financially. There was never a time when Dick and Joan didn't have money problems.

Today Dick makes around \$14,000—before taxes. In earlier years, when his pay was much lower, they had to cope with such expenses as \$4,000 for orthodontia for four of their young daughters.

For the past several months, Joan's been working as a supermarket cashier three days a week to bolster the family's finances. Therese, 19, lived at home until she recently married. Mark, 18, is enrolled in an auto-mechanics course that costs \$82 a month.

Apart from financial help, with Dick's own health problems, he and Joan now lack even the physical capacity to give his parents the care they need. "We spent sleepless nights worrying," Joan relates. "At least we didn't have to feel we were the ones who pushed them into the nursing home. While they were there we saw to it that someone visited them almost every day. Even when they wanted to leave . . . if we were upset, it was only because they decided so suddenly. Within a day or two they wanted us to find a housekeeper and bring them home. Grandma was really bothered when she went into the nursing home. Emotionally, they're far better off at home."

At that point a four-alarm crisis would have erupted were it not for the availability of a pioneering agency for elderly people. This is the Minneapolis Age and Opportunity Center, which provides supportive services to help elderly people stay in their own homes rather than go to nursing homes.

The older Butlers' doctor had agreed to their leaving the nursing home only if they got the help of M.A.O., as local people call the Age and Opportunity Center. Marie had really been sick. She had—and still has—diabetic foot ulcers, a heart condition and a medically impressive list of related conditions. She also must care for Frank, who requires constant medication for the chronic bronchitis caused by his years of going in and out of meat-refrigerator rooms.

So when Joan and Dick had restored the older Butlers to their own home and settled them down, it was a great relief for all when M.A.O. took over.

M.A.O.'s services are tailored to the specific needs of its elderly clients. For Marie and Frank, M.A.O. delivers two meals a day—one hot dinner and one cold lunch for the next day. Marie need only prepare breakfast. In fact, it was her ability to prepare at least breakfast that convinced M.A.O. that with its two meals and other services, the Butlers could get along at home.

M.A.O. also sends a homemaker once a week to do the heavier cleaning, such as vacuuming and changing the beds, and a choreman to occasionally spruce up the small yard. Another vital M.A.O. service is transportation to clinics, including its own operated in conjunction with Abbott-Northwestern Hospital.

The transportation has been especially helpful for Frank. One of M.A.O.'s fleet of minibuses and station wagons brings him to the Veterans Administration clinic for periodic treatments. Last fall when he had to go into the hospital for four weeks, M.A.O. brought Marie there almost every day to visit him.

Dick and Joan's children, who range from 26 to 18, three married, supply any transportation that M.A.O. can't, and also do chores when they're in town or have time off from school or work. Marie has two brothers who also help with shopping and transportation.

It's this carefully dovetailed combination of services from M.A.O. and help from relatives that makes such care tolerable for relatives and financially feasible for M.A.O. But what cements the teamwork in this case is that the Butler children and their grand-children care for each other.

For others, M.A.O. also provides personal care if needed, such as help with bathing,

financial counseling, information on resources like food stamps, an emergency food shelf and even emergency money, and legal services for wills and estates, Social Security eligibility and other legal problems of the elderly.

M.A.O. even has a handyman whom it sends over to build a wheelchair ramp, if needed, fix a furnace or small appliances, or provide other repairs elderly people often badly need. For Marie and Frank the handyman does any needed painting and puts up the storms and screens—the kind of jobs Dick and Bill used to do for them.

M.A.O. is the creation of an articulate, active, community volunteer, Daphne Krause, now its executive director. As a community worker she perceived the need for a multi-service organization for the elderly. She believes a crisis is developing in their care, for the senior population is increasing by 1,000 a day while the working population that must support the seniors has shrunk because of the low birth rate in the Depression.

The convenient solution of storing the elderly in nursing homes has been accelerated by recent changes in both laws and attitudes. Children are no longer held to be financially responsible for their parents. Frank Butler says 80 percent of the nursing-home residents had their expenses paid for by the State Medicaid program.

But Daphne Krause came to feel that many nursing-home residents could be cared for in their own homes if comprehensive support was available. She felt that both the seniors and the taxpayers, now footing a swelling bill for institutional care, could benefit greatly. She first took her concept to senior-citizen groups. They told her what seniors need and formed the first board of directors. Now it also includes representatives from labor unions, churches, medical groups, family agencies and community organizations such as the Junior League. Daphne also enlisted the Abbott-Northwestern Hospital in setting up a clinic and won the financial backing of community and government agencies and private donors.

The clinic and full services have been operating just since 1968, but already M.A.O. is getting national attention including from Congress. Senate experts see M.A.O. as a potential model for elderly-care and as an alternative to costly nursing homes.

Today, M.A.O. works on two simple but accurate premises. One is that medical services are not enough: The elderly need a full range of services and need to be able to get them all from one agency. The other concept is to tailor the care to help the elderly maintain various levels of independence.

Thus, M.A.O. even operates an employment service and places elderly people in good health in positions where they can help those in poor health, even as live-in companions.

Some of these activities are on a volunteer basis, such as part-time office work for M.A.O., shopping for other elderly people and so on. For others, such as the senior handyman project, retired men receive pay for repair work, painting, yardwork and similar jobs.

The elderly served by M.A.O. pay modest fees, if they can afford them. Marie and Frank pay only \$1 a day for their home-delivered meals. Others may pay up to \$1.85—M.A.O.'s cost. Partial payment can even be made in food stamps. There's no charge at all in some circumstances; if, for example, a senior citizen has high medical bills or a Social Security check has been stolen. The program is so carefully planned that the drivers who deliver meals are even coached on how to deal with any medical emergencies they may encounter. Also, there is no set rate for other services. M.A.O. tells clients its costs; for example, that homemaker and handyman services cost M.A.O. about \$3.75 an hour. Users contribute whatever they can. (Some oldsters have contributed as little as 25¢.)

The clinic is a key part of the M.A.O. program, especially in a period of rising medical bills, when fixed incomes of older people especially have been eroded by the rise in living costs. In general, the proportion of medical expenses paid by Medicare has shrunk. This means that many older people are deprived of care. Doctors at the clinic found that many patients had not seen a doctor in years and that most needed immediate medical attention.

For that reason, since late '73 the clinic not only has expanded its services but provides them at no charge above the Medicare, Medicaid, or any insurance reimbursement for an individual whose income is \$4,500 or less (\$5,500 for a couple). There's no "means test." The clinic simply accepts the members' word about finances. The services even include prescriptions filled at hospital cost, nursing services at home when needed, specialist eye care, emotional counseling and blood-donor service. Some of the expenses of the clinic are absorbed by the Abbott-Northwestern Hospital.

The clinic also provides health checkups, which brought it temporarily into confrontation with Blue Cross, the Medicare supervisory agency in the Minneapolis area, because Medicare doesn't usually cover "routine checkups." But the clinic insisted that preventive checkups facilitate early and thus more effective treatment. This logic won the day but not before the issue became the subject of a U.S. Senate hearing.

DOLLAR-A-DAY FEE

It's only because Marie and Frank pay just \$1 a day toward M.A.O.'s services that they can get along on their \$360 a month. They buy no clothes. (The grandchildren provide Marie with housedresses.) Their biggest expense is her medicine. Frank gets his medicines through the V.A. and is still annoyed that the V.A. provided his medicines but the nursing home charged him 75 cents a day "for dishing it out."

Their other major expenses are about \$50 a month for utilities, phone and heat; \$20-\$25 for food other than meals supplied by M.A.O., and \$400 a year for property taxes, stabilized for them as senior citizens under local law. As one insight into the spending ways of seniors, they spend nothing at all on entertainment but about \$250 a year on birthday and Christmas gifts. Still, the Butlers are in a race with inflation. Frank notes that "every time Social Security goes up, so does Medicare, so the increases don't help much."

If M.A.O. is the wave of the future, it has yet to reach most American towns (except for a similar agency in Athens, Georgia). Many of the individual components of the M.A.O. program probably are available in your area. But if you have the responsibility for the care of elderly relatives, you may have to assemble these fragments yourself, perhaps with the help of a local family service or senior citizens' agency, advises B. C. Fisher of New York's Community Service Society.

One of the most widely available services is "Meals on Wheels," like the M.A.O. program that brings Marie and Frank their meals. This service is partly financed by the Federal Government. In some cities the public school systems operate the "Meals on Wheels" program, putting the school cafeterias to useful double duty.

Many programs have been organized by Senior Citizen and Golden Age Clubs affiliated with the National Council of Senior Citizens, including the Senior Aides program of part-time jobs.

Another widespread service is telephone reassurance, sometimes called "Ring A Day." At prearranged times, volunteers—often seniors themselves—call elderly people living alone. If there is no answer, or in an emergency, the caller knows beforehand which doctor, neighbor and relatives to notify. A

specialist in problems of widowhood, Dr. Virginia R. Coevering, has written a booklet, *Guidelines for a Telephone Reassurance Service*, published by the Institute of Gerontology. In the belief that this service can make a vital difference in the lives of isolated and elderly people, the Institute, located at 543 Church St., Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104, offers the booklet free.

Perhaps the most innovative self-help program is the Jamaica, N.Y., Service Program for Older Adults. It brought together community organizations and senior-citizen groups to provide services and activity programs, with the seniors themselves involved in helping elderly residents. A Senior Citizen Advisory Council helped identify what local older people themselves consider to be their primary needs and interests. The Council initiated a senior citizens' crime-prevention program; worked to get free checking accounts for seniors from local banks; helped sponsor health fairs and seminars, and distributed a "health passport"—a wallet card recording essential health data which might be needed in an emergency.

Seniors increasingly are helping others through the nationwide Retired Senior Volunteer Program. R.S.V.P. already operates in 600 communities with help from the Federal ACTION agency.

Homemaker and visiting-nurse services are also available. You can send a stamped self-addressed envelope for a local list of the National Council for Homemaker-Home Health Aide Services, 67 Irving Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.

One type of home care that elderly ill people probably can invoke more often is the home health visits by medical personnel available under Medicare and Medicaid programs. Such care must be approved by the patient's physician as part of a treatment plan. A government survey found this benefit under-utilized.

For Marie and Frank Butler, the availability of all these services in one agency has meant a chance to spend more years in their own home with the feeling of independence and dignity they prize. To Joan and Dick, this pioneering agency has brought peace of mind after years of worry over their parents, and more time to deal with their own health problems and their children's needs.

THE 20TH ANNUAL PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House. Each year I have held public office I have made public my income in detail.

I insert into the RECORD the press release and the financial statement:

SIMON ISSUES 20TH ANNUAL COMPLETE PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—For the 20th consecutive year, Congressman Paul Simon, D-Carbondale, Ill., issued a complete personal financial statement Monday (4-21-75), along with financial statements for the five members of his staff earning over \$15,000 per year.

The two-decade practice—believed to be longer than for any other public official in the country—spans the entire length of Simon's service as an Illinois state Representative, state Senator, Lt. Governor and Congressman from the 24th District.

The financial statement shows that Simon

and his wife earned income totaling \$10,895.82 in 1974, a drop of \$33,000 from 1973. (The freshman Congressman campaigned virtually full time last year.)

The statement also shows assets of \$238,366.19 and liabilities of \$147,463.80, yielding a net worth of \$90,902.39.

"In addition to my own personal statements," Simon said, "I've been advocating for the past two decades that all key elected and appointed officials be required by law to disclose their income, assets and liabilities."

"I'm not criticizing those public officials who don't make voluntary statements, but I believe legally required statements are the best way to solve the conflict of interest problems that have plagued government at all levels."

The staff disclosures issued with Simon's statement continue a practice he began as Lt. Governor of Illinois, when he became the first state official in the nation to require such disclosures of his employees.

1974 Income Congressman Paul Simon and family

Income of Paul and Jeanne Simon:	
Fairchild Industries, dividend	\$2.40
Sangamon State University salary (services rendered through Jan. 15)	1,205.00
United Merchants & Manufacturers, dividends	11.20
National Industries, Inc., dividend	1.24
Crown Zellerbach, dividends	11.40
Maremont Corp., dividends	5.20
Christian Century Foundation, travel reimbursement	80.32
Metamora newspaper payment of \$245.25 in principal and \$128.75 in interest from sale of paper in 1965	374.00
Harper and Row, dividend	4.00
AT&T, dividends	8.00
Rohr Industries, dividends	2.72
Simon and Schuster, dividends	1.50
Fruehauf Corp., dividends	7.20
Brunswick, dividends	.40
Rental income, Troy home (subsequently sold)	1,750.00
Springfield Marine Bank, refund	7.75
Congressional campaign account reimbursements for travel, phone, lodging, etc.	1,126.19
Olive Branch Lutheran Church, Okawville, talk	25.00
Book royalties	1,317.74
Ralston Purina, dividends	3.20
Marcor, dividends	8.00
Scott Paper, dividends	2.72
Bethlehem Steel, dividends	12.50
Polish National Alliance	1.36
Texaco, dividends	29.40
General American Life, interest	26.79
Chrysler, dividends	2.80
Norton Simon, dividends	3.40
Lear Siegler, dividends	18.75
Warner Lambert, dividends	3.36
Westinghouse, dividends	11.48
Mass Investors, dividends	18.08
National Steel, dividends	6.00
Lutheran Layman's League, Talk	30.00
Adams Express, dividends	51.98
State of Illinois, pension fund refund for Jeanne Simon (non-income)	180.00
Church Women United of Marion, talk by Jeanne	10.00
Refund of rent deposit, Carbondale	225.00
St. Peter and Paul Catholic Church, Collinsville, talk by Jeanne	25.00
Borg-Warner, dividends	13.50
Insurance refund on Springfield home	152.00

Reimbursement expense for editor's dinner.....	\$44.37
Louisiana State University, \$750 honorarium and \$220.96 travel expenses.....	970.96
Northern Illinois University, travel reimbursement.....	137.70
Ludlow Corp., dividends.....	40.50
Travel reimbursement.....	11.96
National Aviation, dividends.....	61.48
Luthern Church in America, talk in Kansas City, honorarium and travel.....	233.25
Vandalia farm income.....	763.59
Steeleville Education Assn., travel expenses.....	20.00
Polish National Alliance Insurance refund.....	30.38
Ill. State Treasurer's Office, for legal work by Jeanne.....	1,500.00
Interest, savings account, University Bank, C'dale.....	56.84
Interest, savings account, C'dale National Bank.....	16.21
Trinity Methodist Church, Salem, talk.....	15.00
Insurance refund on Troy house.....	217.00
Total	10,895.82
Income for Sheila Simon, 1974:	
Interest, United Savings and Loan, Troy.....	\$20.09
Interest, Carbondale Savings and Loan.....	3.21
Dividends, Ford Motor.....	3.20
Dividends, AT&T.....	6.32
Total	32.82

Income for Martin Simon, 1974:	
Interest, United Savings and Loan, Troy.....	20.09
Dividends, Ford Motor.....	3.20
Dividends, AT&T.....	6.32
Total	29.42

Real estate sales, 1974:	
Springfield real estate—purchase price plus improvements, \$49,830; sold in 1974 for.....	51,500.00
Troy real estate—purchase price plus improvements, \$34,650; sold in 1974 for.....	47,500.00
Total	99,000.00

Statement of assets and liabilities of Paul and Jeanne Simon as of April 1, 1975

Assets:	
House, 511 West Main, Carbondale.....	\$40,000.00
House, 11421 Falls Road, Pottomac, Md.*.....	126,000.00
Balance, checking account, University Bank of Carbondale.....	137.66
Balance, checking account, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.....	2,636.30
Balance, savings account, University Bank of Carbondale.....	56.84
Note held in partial payment for sale of Troy home.....	20,000.00
Cash value, Illinois General Assembly retirement system.....	16,233.10
Cash value, Universities Retirement System, Illinois.....	2,425.63
Cash value, Congressional retirement system.....	831.09
Cash value, Gen. American Life Insurance policy.....	2,958.21

*Like all newcomers to the Washington area, we went through the shock of learning real estate prices. We ended up paying more than twice what we had expected to pay for a home, a fairly common experience among newcomers to the Washington scene.

Cash value, Polish National Alliance Insurance Policy.....	\$614.88
1974 Chevrolet, approximate value.....	2,800.00
1965 Ford Mustang, approximate value.....	250.00
Household furniture and Presidential autographs, approximate value.....	10,000.00
Balance still owed for sale of newspapers.....	5,000.00
Balance, savings acct., Carbondale, Nat. Bank.....	513.48
Stocks (see attached list).....	7,909.00
Total assets	238,366.10
Liabilities:	
Mortgage on Carbondale home, University Bank of Carbondale.....	20,124.95
Personal loans, University Bank of Carbondale.....	8,198.24
Loan, University Bank of Carbondale.....	21,914.94
Mortgages on home in Pottomac, Md. (Weaver Bros. Mortgage Brokers, \$15,101.48; Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Fischer of Pennsylv., \$53,467.71; Richard Gibson and Lee Glover, immediate predecessors as owners, \$25,456.48).....	94,025.67
Unsecured loan, First National Bank of Collinsville.....	3,200.00
Total liabilities	147,463.80
Assets	238,366.19
Liabilities	147,463.80
Net worth	90,902.39

Not mentioned as a liability, but an obligation of Paul Simon is \$13,500.00 borrowed from the Salem National Bank for his campaign committee. This deficit hopefully will be cleared up in the next campaign.

Not mentioned in this report but mentioned in the previous report is the small farm property owned south of Vandalia. This was sold in early 1975, with the details of the sale to be reported in the next annual statement.

Assets of Children: Assets held in the children's names are 10 shares each (for Martin and Sheila) of Mutual Real Estate Investment Trust; one share each of Ford Motor; two shares each of AT&T; one State of Israel Bond each with a face value of \$100; and the following amounts in savings accounts: Sheila—United Savings and Loan, Troy, \$408.10, and Carbondale Savings and Loan, \$207.29; Martin—United Savings and Loan, Troy, \$405.33.

Stock holdings

(Market prices as of March 27, 1975)

Shares and stock (stocks have been purchased through Newhard-Cook, Belleville, and I. M. Simon—no relative—of Carbondale):

50 Book of the Month.....	\$1,018
40 Hardees.....	160
50 Ludlow.....	468
20 Borg-Warner.....	340
10 Harper & Row.....	75
49 Massachusetts Investors Growth.....	448
25 Mutual Real Estate, approximate.....	50
15 Simon & Schuster, approximate.....	50
6 Norton Simon.....	115
2 Norton Simon Preferred.....	85
121 Adams Express.....	1,104
111 National Aviation.....	1,179
2 American Telephone and Telegraph, preferred.....	107
5 Bethlehem Steel.....	172
8 Borman's.....	19
1 Brunswick.....	13
10 Chock Full of Nuts.....	37

2 Chrysler.....	\$21
6 Crown Zellerbach.....	193
2 Curtis Publishing.....	2
8 Fairchild Industries.....	51
4 Fruehauf.....	68
8 Lear Siegler, preferred.....	183
8 Marcor.....	172
13 Maremont.....	157
3 National Inds., warrants.....	3
1 National Inds., preferred.....	11
2 National Steel.....	80
4 Pepsi Cola.....	239
4 Ralston Purina.....	160
3 Rohr Industries.....	24
4 Scott Paper.....	69
14 Texaco.....	346
8 United M&M.....	112
4 Warner Lambert.....	131
5 H.R. Weissberg, approximate.....	5
4 Westinghouse.....	58
2 Westinghouse, preferred.....	84
120 Jet-Life, approximate.....	300
Total	7,909

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, STAFF OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL SIMON (SUBMITTED TO CONGRESSMAN SIMON IN APRIL, 1975)

MARGARET BERGIN, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

1974 income other than from government: dividends from Baxter Laboratories, AT&T, Reliance Electric Co., Mead Corp., General Public Utilities Corp., El Paso National Gas Co., Virginia Electric Power Co., totaling approximately \$600; interest from Farm and Home Savings and Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, totaling about \$210.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Community Bank of West Frankfort, Ill., \$8,600; Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$3,673.03.

Stocks and bonds owned: AT&T, Mead Corp., Baxter Laboratories, El Paso National Gas Co., Virginia Electric Power Co., American Motors Inns, General Public Utilities Corp., Reliance Electric Co., totaling approximately \$20,000; shares in Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, totaling \$6,658.

Property owned: one-third interest in a 133-acre farm in Midland, Virginia with farmhouse and barn, purchased in 1972 and valued at approximately \$77,000 (total value).

RAY BUSS, DISTRICT ASSISTANT

1974 income other than from government: \$13,200, Paul Simon for Congress Committee. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Salem (Ill.) National Bank, auto loan, \$6,487.

Stocks and bonds owned: none. Property owned: 1975 Dodge Monaco, approximate value, \$6,000; household furniture, approximate value, \$2,500.

RAY JOHNSEN, OFFICE MANAGER

1974 income other than from government: \$11,200, Paul Simon for Congress Committee; \$58.88, General Motors dividends; \$198.00, Roodhouse Record dividends, \$115.90, Metamora Herald, int.; \$136.30, Carbondale, S&L, int.; \$300.00, Troy Tribune, int., \$580.00, American S&L, int.; \$3.00, Sangamon S&L, int.; \$80.00, General American Life, int.; \$12.00, Metropolitan Life, int.; \$220.70, sale of Metamora Herald stock; \$3,000, sale of Troy Pub. Co. stock; \$4,375, sale of Troy Security Bank stock; \$2,060.00, rent from Troy property.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$1,000; Washington & Lee Savings and Loan, \$48,200.

Stocks and bonds owned: 100 shares Cottonwood Junction, Inc., \$10,000; 24 shares, Watson Lumber Co., \$7,200; 17 shares General Motors, \$850; shares, Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$110.

Property owned: Ill. State Employees Retirement System, \$1,772; note, Troy Tribune, \$2,000; house, Vienna, Va., \$87,500; real estate, Troy, Ill., \$28,000; household furnishings,

\$15,000; 1974 Chevrolet wagon, \$3,500; 1971 Camaro, \$1,000; balance, sale of newspapers, \$4,800.

TERRY MICHAEL, PRESS SECRETARY

1974 income other than government: \$4,675, Paul Simon for Congress Committee. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: auto loan, First National Bank of Springfield (Ill.), \$1,480.

Stocks and bonds owned: shares, Congressional Employees Federal Credit Union, \$101.

Property owned: 1973 Oldsmobile Cutlas, \$2,400.

PAUL GAYER, DISTRICT ASSISTANT

1974 income other than government: \$165, Benton Comm. Bank, int.; \$335.30, W. Frankfort Comm. Bank, int.; \$149.40, Bank of Ziegler, int.; 10.92, Metropolitan Life, int.; \$7.35, dividends, Nat. Invest. Corp.

Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: \$6,000, car loan.

Stocks and bonds owned: \$3,500, U.S. Series E Bonds; 131 shares, Nat. Investors Corp.; \$622; 71 shares, Gayer Invest. Corp., \$7,100.

Property owned: 1973 Ford Maverick, \$2,100; 1974 Lincoln Continental, \$6,000; home and lot, Ziegler, \$10,000; vacant lot, Ziegler, \$300; two-thirds interest in following Ziegler property—Grant & Maryland St., \$2,667; 201 Church St., \$460; 215 Church St., \$200; 217 Church St., \$200; Penn Street, \$2,667.

POST CARDS WOULD NOT GET VOTERS TO THE POLLS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today I received a resolution opposing the Federal post card voter registration bill from the International Institute of Municipal Clerks.

The institute is a professional organization of city, village, town, and township clerks in large and small municipalities in all 50 States. The majority of its members are the election administrators in their communities. It is important for us to listen carefully to their objections and concerns because, after all, they are the group most experienced in the registration and election processes. The people who know the process best say that the postcard registration bill will "result in many problems of administration and fraud and will not solve the fundamental question of getting voters to the polls."

The resolution and letter of transmittal follow:

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

OF MUNICIPAL CLERKS,

PASADENA, CALIF., April 17, 1975.

Hon. BILL FRENZEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRENZEL: The International Institute of Municipal Clerks would like to express its opposition to Federal legislation which would establish a nationwide system of postcard registration. Such legislation will result in many problems of administration and fraud and will not solve the fundamental question of getting the voter to the polls.

The International Institute of Municipal Clerks is a professional organization of city, village, town, and township clerks in large

and small municipalities in all 50 States. The majority of its members are the election administrators in their communities and they are aware of the necessity for simplified and fair registration procedures.

The International Institute of Municipal Clerks offers its assistance and resources to work for the overall improvement of our elections system. It welcomes the opportunity to provide you with input from this experienced and concerned group.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. HUNNEWELL,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON VOTER REGISTRATION BY POSTCARD SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL CLERKS, APRIL 16, 1975

The International Institute of Municipal Clerks is opposed to the enactment of Federal legislation which would require the use of postcard mailings in registration of voters for Federal elections.

The IIMC adopted this position after careful study by its legislative and executive committees and after thorough consideration by the membership at its 1974 Annual Business Meeting.

The IIMC is a professional organization of 2,600 city, village, town, and township clerks with representation in all 50 states and from all sizes of municipalities. The Municipal Clerk is traditionally the local election administrator, and the majority of the IIMC members have some responsibility in the conduct of local, state, and national elections.

Municipal Clerks are aware that people must be encouraged to exercise their right to vote. They continue to implement programs and techniques to make the registration procedure easier for eligible voters including simplifying procedures; opening their offices in the evenings and on weekends; hiring extra help and deputy registrars; conducting door-to-door, neighborhood, and high school registration drives; and utilizing radio, television, newspapers, and direct mail.

The IIMC supports all efforts which would increase participation in our election process at all levels of government. It, however, seriously questions the merits of a national registration program which would be imposed upon the individual state and local jurisdictions without thorough study and full debate.

A massive Federally-imposed postcard registration program is fraught with pitfalls. Some of the major difficulties that would be created by such legislation are:

1. A Federal registration program cannot be effectively integrated into the state laws and local ordinances which set forth the time tables and procedures in voter registration. Therefore, the procedure for registering through the mail for Federal elections will be a separate step to administer.

2. States wishing to conform the uniform requirements of Federal postcard registration to their own state ad local elections will have to change their election codes, possibly amending their constitutions. This would be a difficult and tedious process, especially if the legislature and the general public are skeptical of the merits of the program.

3. States not able to adopt the Federal postcard registration law for their own state and local elections will have to maintain separate voter eligibility records: one set for persons registered through the Federal postcard process and who would be qualified to vote only in Federal elections, and another set for persons who are qualified to vote in all elections. Confusion among the voters as to what election they are eligible to vote in would make the voting process more difficult for them.

4. A Federal Agency would prepare the voter registration forms and the U.S. Post Office would deliver the forms to potential voters, yet the local election administrator would be responsible for the administration of returned forms. This process is insufficiently controlled and involves needless duplication.

The election administrator would need to compare each postcard registration form to lists from previously returned postcards and to lists of registered voters. Often he would be unable to follow through on forms which had been improperly or illegibly filled out. There would be no way to verify the accuracy of the information on the returned cards. The election administrator would also need to guard against disenfranchising qualified voters who for reasons he could not know or control had their postcard form returned as being undeliverable.

5. A massive mailing of such forms could tempt persons to obtain voter registration cards for a purpose other than voting. Minors could obtain them for use in purchasing alcoholic beverages or other activities requiring proof of age. Illegal aliens could obtain them as proof of citizenship and residency. There is no personal check to verify that the information provided on the card is indeed correct.

A voter registration card obtained in one state must be accepted as *Prima Facie* proof in another state that the person is a registered voter and a citizen.

6. The sudden imposition of a total nationwide postcard registration program would take priority over the ongoing and more effective state & local voter registration programs. The election administrator with limited resources at his disposal would have to concentrate the efforts of his office in carrying out the responsibilities of the Federal program.

7. Postcard registration is not the most effective manner to register new voters. An analysis of mail registration in New Jersey and Maryland reveals that voter registration was not substantially increased in either state as a result of the practice. In New Jersey, total registration for 1974 was less than it had been for the gubernatorial election of 1973. In one large Maryland County with voter registration by mail, the number of new registrants was less than it had been in 1970, the most recent comparable election year, despite the fact that the county had experienced substantial growth. In Minnesota, the third state which initiated a major program of voter registration by mail during 1974, it seems that more voters took advantage of election day registration at the polls than registration in advance by mail.

The IIMC suggests that the enactment of a nationwide postcard registration procedure at this time would cause more problems than benefits obtained. Instead, the IIMC suggests that Federal legislation be enacted which would be more productive in raising citizen interest in voting not just in registering.

The Federal government should offer a program of financial assistance and technical advice which would assist state and local jurisdictions to combat citizens apathy. This should include direct reimbursement to all state and local jurisdictions whose programs encourage people to register and to vote. The procedures and techniques developed in such program should be published and disseminated to election administration officials throughout the country.

The Federal government should also provide financial and technical assistance to states and local jurisdictions to improve their election administration and to implement innovative operational procedures and systems that improve the overall efficiency of election administration. This technical information and data, likewise, should be made available on a wide basis.

The enactment of a nationwide Federal postcard registration program should be delayed until 1980 to allow study and input on state-operated registration by mail programs. A number of states are presently considering legislation to permit registration by mail which will make voters eligible for all types of elections. Since these programs will be designed to be most effective for the individual states, they should have the opportunity to implement and test their programs to produce the maximum results. This would allow any future Federal legislation in this area to apply uniform standards based upon a broader use of registration by mail.

Finally, the continuing decline of participation in elections is not solely related to persons unable to register. The Institute of Election Administration of the American University points out that "Vigorous efforts by election officials, decentralized voter registration, registration by mail in some states, and increasing use of voter information material by election boards have made it easier to register and vote". Since 1963, the pattern across the nation is one of reduced requirements for voting, simplified voter registration requirements and procedures and less frequent purging of the rolls for nonvoting.

Yet the voter turnout remains low. Voter apathy and not necessarily legal and administrative restrictions continues to be the prevalent reason for low voter turnout.

The IIMC respectively suggests that Federal legislation would be most effective in providing overall guidelines and assistance to state and local jurisdictions to meet the total challenge of sound election administration at the grass roots level of citizen participation. Citizen involvement in their election process can be increased by restoring confidence in our effective democratic system, not by mandate or by concentrating on only one aspect of the problem.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. WEAVER. Mr Speaker, today the Committee on Armed Services conducted hearings on a bill, H.R. 3689, which would authorize the expenditure of some \$66 billion in the next 27 months for military weaponry.

Sixty-six billion dollars in an awesome figure. It is a sum of money that would be totally lost to our economy, for it will be spent to make goods which will not—we earnestly pray—be consumed by Americans.

The jobs created by these expenditures are quiet different from jobs in such industries as housing, medical care, or food production for in the latter the goods are purchased by our own people. The people who make weapons are paid to produce goods which are not consumed. Military spending is inherently inflationary.

Military expenditure then represents an extreme sacrifice to the well-being of our economy. Each dollar we spend in this field must be absolutely essential to our security.

We do need a strong military defense.

It is in the nature of mankind to be aggressive and paranoid as well as generous and compassionate. There are tyrants—even madmen—who command entire nations. We must maintain our guard.

But what constitutes a strong defense? To protect our shores and skies. To have reserves to enable us to aid when attacked people critical to our security, friendly to ourselves, and who are led by governments truly representing their governed. To keep us from feeling threatened.

But is it necessary to have the force to blow up the world 10 times over? Twenty times over? Is it necessary when we have the present power to unleash the ultimate destructive force to match our potential attackers in every weapon, in every sophisticated device to make the world an automated battleground?

Do we, I asked my colleagues in this Congress, need the B-1 bomber when we are already overarmed? We do not.

We have reached that state of military idiocy achieved in the middle ages by the feudal knight who was so burdened by his suit of armor he could no longer fight.

Then what of our preparedness in conventional warfare? We must choose our ground so carefully that further weaponry is not essential. As for limited nuclear warfare, that concept shows such an ignorance of reality it can lead only to the end of life on Earth for once the atomic weapon is used it will be countered and recouped until the world is no more.

If this Congress cuts this budget sharply—as I believe we should—does this mean we are becoming isolationists? Hardly. We are spending six times the rate for defense as we did in the 1930's when measured against the gross national product.

And will our adversaries take a budget cut as a sign of weakness and test us? They know, as we know, that we can end their existence. And they can end ours. But we should all understand the assumption that we own half the world and the Soviet Union the other half, is simply not true. The reality is that there are many, many people who do not like either of us and will resist—effectively—domination.

Vietnam has been one such place and I believe the Middle East is another. Certainly the Western democracies will count us a stronger partner now that the Indochinese issue has been decided and we are freed to consider matters of real importance to our security and to the well being of this Nation.

We know that inflation is a constant danger, our greatest threat. A sharp cut in the military authorization would be the surest stroke this committee could make in the fundamental defense of this Nation.

The well-being of our Nation rests upon a strong economy, a united people, and a spirit of accomplishment. We must no longer base our entire defense on weapons but must look to our people and their needs and aspirations as the source of our real strength.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE HONORABLE ALBERT ILLES OF WAYNE, N.J., INTERNATIONALLY RENOWNED FLORICULTURIST AND RECIPIENT OF 1975 AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO NEW JERSEY AGRICULTURE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege and honor to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress the lifetime of outstanding public service that our people have received from a distinguished citizen of my congressional district, internationally renowned floriculturist, my good friend and neighbor, the Honorable Albert Illes of Wayne, N.J.

Al Illes has been a master artist in the agricultural world bringing the warmth of joy and wonderment to all with his expressions of beauty in flowers that he has seeded and nurtured from his youthful days in his native Hungary where he was educated in the floricultural sciences to his career pursuits since coming to the United States in 1922.

In civic affairs, his standards of excellence and richness of his wisdom have earned him the highest respect and esteem of all of us—always giving willingly and unselfishly of his time in helping to bring happiness and contentment to others through his benevolence and understanding particularly to those in need.

It may well be that his inner greatness was most poignantly demonstrated in the rare beauty and name of the flower that he discovered and called "America" which won first prize in the 1934 International Flower Show.

Mr. Speaker, by inserting, with your permission, at this point in our historic journal of Congress the citation of the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture for his distinguished service to New Jersey agriculture, I would like to share with you the pride of his wife Marie, his family and his many, many friends in his personal commitment and endeavors that have endeared Al Illes to all of us for his dedication and devotion toward improving the quality, and preserving the integrity of our environment. The citation reads as follows:

ALBERT ILLES

Flowers speak a meaningful language when people are born, marry, mark anniversaries, launch a ship or a new business, are sick, even at death. Our flower farmers provide a commodity that is almost as valued for the good life as is our daily bread.

Albert Illes, you have been a flower farmer all your life, pursuing a career not just for business, but as a fine artist whose purpose is to create masterpieces that give happiness and hope to others. As testimony to your natural talent and skillful practice of floricultural science in which you were educated in the School of Agriculture in your native Hungary, a previously unknown variety of lily you discovered and named "America" for your adopted land won first prize in the 1934 International Flower Show. You are held in

such high esteem that you were a judge on that prestigious show for 30 years.

Born in 1897, after college you apprenticed in floriculture in Vienna, and worked in European agriculture before coming to the United States in 1922. You managed a plant nursery in Connecticut and a leading florist business in New York City, until 25 years ago when you and your wife and helpmate, Marie, established the Circle Greenhouse at Wayne in Passaic County, New Jersey. There, under an acre of glass, you grew flowers until last year when the State Highway Department acquired the property which stood in the path of Interstate Route 80.

Active in many organizations, you served as president of the New York Florist Club, New Jersey State Florists Club, and the New Jersey Plant and Flower Growers Association. You are a member of Metropolitan Nurserymen's Association and the New Jersey Agricultural Society, and a former director of the New Jersey Farm Supply Cooperative. In 1959, you were elected "Man of the Year" by the Passaic County Florists Club. You also served as president, vice president and treasurer of the Passaic County Board of Agriculture, and are still active on that board.

A charter member and former president of the Wayne Rotary Club, and the Wayne Chamber of Commerce, you are also a member of the Passaic County Shrine Club, Little Falls Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, Little Falls Square Club, Lakeland and Highpoint Shrine Club, Newark Royal Order of Jesters, and Newark Circus of Saints and Sinners Club of America.

To acknowledge and express thanks for your many contributions to the flower world, and to your community, county, state and nation, the State Board of Agriculture awards this citation for distinguished service to Albert Illes.

Mr. Speaker, this public recognition has been established by the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture for more than a century to record an official expression of deep gratitude from the people of the State of New Jersey to those who have responded unselfishly and effectively in the farming world and allied professions and commerce for their outstanding contributions of public service for the betterment of our industry and rural life.

Al Illes received the 1975 highest award for distinguished service to New Jersey agriculture and I know you and our colleagues will want to join with me now in congressional recognition and appreciation for his lifetime endeavors that have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. We do, indeed, salute Al Illes, a distinguished citizen and great American.

WILLIAM H. BURKE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the news of the death last week of one of my dearest friends and a man that I know has close ties with many of my colleagues, Mr. William H. Burke of Hatfield, Mass.

Bill Burke was a legend in Massachusetts politics. He was elected, in 1936, the youngest-ever chairman of the State

Democratic Committee. But the scope of his power and influence extended to the national level as he worked behind the scenes as "kingmaker" at several national conventions.

Although for decades he was "Mr. Democrat" in the Bay State, he befriended a young Republican lad in the State Senate—and continued as one of my staunchest boosters ever since.

I will never forget the gesture he made in my last campaign as chairman of his home county "Democrats for CONTE" organization.

At this time, I extend my sincerest sympathy to Bill's sons William H. Burke III, and Robert E. Burke, and his daughter Diane, and the entire Burke family. At this point in the RECORD, I insert excerpts from the obituary report that was carried in the Springfield, Mass., Union: W. H. BURKE WAS BOSTON PORT COLLECTOR

Mr. William H. Burke, 68, of 29 Main Street, Hatfield, a power in National Democratic politics for 40 years and this state's youngest elected Democratic state chairman who went on to become collector of the port in Boston died Thursday afternoon at his home.

Burke, during his 40 years in the national political arena, helped shape the course of major elections. He represented Massachusetts at national Democratic conventions during the 30's, 40's and 50's.

He was a great admirer of Franklin D. Roosevelt and supported his election campaign in the 1930's and was active in the 1944 campaign to oust Vice President Henry A. Wallace. The Democratic Convention in Chicago in July 1944 once again chose Roosevelt, but party leaders, including Burke led the fight to replace Wallace with Harry S. Truman, who was elected and became 33rd President after Roosevelt's death on April 12, 1945.

President Truman nominated Burke to the post of Collector of the Port in Boston. His nomination was confirmed by the U.S. Senate. During his tenure on the job, he was in charge of collecting taxes at the port of entry and regulating the port's processes.

While in the post that spanned eight years, Burke hired several young men from Western Massachusetts who were attending law school or college in the Boston area.

In 1936, he was elected this state's youngest chairman of the state Democratic Committee. He left the chairmanship during the period President Truman was in office and resumed it in 1953 after President Dwight D. Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in the Presidential election. He retained the position until the late 1950's.

Burke, a native of Hatfield, was a graduate of Smith Academy. Following graduation he went to work in a Northampton clothing store in which he had part interest.

He also took over the operation of his parents' tobacco and the largest onion farm in Massachusetts. Much of the land has been retained by his three children.

He was married to the late Nora Riley of Northampton. He leaves two sons, William H. Burke, III, a probation officer in the Northampton District Court, and Robert E. Burke, both of Hatfield, a daughter, Diane, of Boston, who is employed at the State House, and several grandchildren.

Presiding Justice Luke F. Ryan, of Northampton District Court and a family friend said, "Bill Burke will always be remembered in Western Massachusetts as a gentleman who enjoyed helping those around him."

In recent years, Burke had been confined to a wheelchair. But he seldom missed a local sporting event and frequently assisted neighbors confronted with bureaucratic red tape.

THE BLOODBATH BY THE COMMUNISTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, debate has been taking place in the Halls on Congress and elsewhere on whether or not there would be a bloodbath by the Communists in the areas that they have taken over in Vietnam. Word is now coming in that the Communists in South Vietnam—like the Communists in the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Tibet, to mention only a very few countries—have begun the spilling of innocent blood. As a number of cables have been received in Washington detailing what is happening.

Part of one of the cables—the full text of which appears below—gives indications of what the North Vietnamese will do:

The Cadre explained that the "PRG" takeover would have three phases:

- A. Military takeover.
- B. Handover by NVA to civilian administrative and investigative (security) cadre, and local forces.
- C. Lo Sat (the slaughterhouse) for all non-"PRG" leadership. The second (b) phase is in effect now."

At this point I include in the RECORD the text of four cables from Saigon:

[DEPARTMENT OF STATE TELEGRAM]

SAIGON.

Subject: NVA/VC treatment of people in recently captured areas

Ref: State.

1. A relatively high-ranking montagnard civil servant who lived with the "PRG" for a week in Dalat City and a week in Song Pha District Town (Ninh Thuan) on April 14 gave us the following information:

2. The GVN governmental apparatus was gone from the Dalat Arfa three days before the NVA came. Two or three NVN civilian cadre, with a couple of armed NVA or in some cases local-force VC, came to each hamlet in the environs and to each precinct of the city to announce the coming of the "PRG". Then they left. They came back the next day and took all but a few weapons.

The cadre left from ten to twenty weapons with the hamlet to be used against vandals, then left again (This was in the rural hamlets, not Dalat City where cadre remained after the first day). Three days later they returned to take all weapons saying that anyone who wanted a rifle could join the "PRG" and continue the fight against the Americans. There were few if any, volunteers.

During this period, the "PRG" cadre (mostly North Vietnamese, some central Vietnamese, a smattering of local Vietnamese and Montagnards) accused and publicly executed, without trial, a number of individuals for vandalism. This occurred in both Dalat and Song Pha.

Beyond political harangues from 1800 to 2000 each night, a prohibition against more than three or four non-family people gathering in the same house, and a compulsory short autobiography from each literate person, the North Vietnamese had taken few other organizational steps before informant left area.

The informant found himself living in the same house with a sympathetic Montagnard "PRG" cadre, in Song Pha. After two days the cadre told him to warn all official and traditional leaders of the local people to leave,

because eventually they would be killed. The cadre explained that the "PRG" takeover would have three phases:

A. Military takeover.
B. Handover by NVA to civilian administrative and investigative (security) cadre, and local forces.

C. Lo Sat (the slaughterhouse) for all non-"PRG" leadership. The second (B) phase is in effect now.

NVA, local force and "PRG" cadre were all insistent on trying to learn the whereabouts of fulro elements and on eliminating them. Fulro is seen as dangerous to them, probably because the leadership is still around and appeals to Montagnards on a more direct basis than the GVN.

[DEPARTMENT OF STATE TELEGRAM]

SAIGON.

Subject: NVA/VC treatment of people in recently captured areas
Ref: State.

1. We have received report from GVN official who had interviewed number national police escapees from MR-1 that Communists have systematically searched out both national police and special branch personnel and in most cases had executed these personnel as soon as they were discovered. He cited example of district police official in MR-1 who was hiding near his home when place was pointed out to Communists by national policeman who was being detained by Communists. Official was pulled from his hiding place and executed on spot. When his mother complained that her son had done nothing to deserve execution, mother was executed by Communist soldier who fired single pistol shot into her head. Incident occurred on 30 Mar. Same source said other incidents were also being reported to him concerning Communist execution of national police personnel. Source reported his house in Danang city was surrounded by Communist soldiers on 30 Mar and was riddled by rifle fire because several national police personnel had been seeking refuge in house on 28 Mar. No one was killed because house was unoccupied. Several national police personnel were summarily executed in Danang city as they were discovered by Communists on 30 and 31 Mar. Source had not talked with anyone who escaped since 31 Mar.

2. Same source said Communists were forcing people to return to native areas and were using GVN military trucks which had been captured in Danang to move population back to home areas. Source said that as of 31 March, gasoline was available for sale in Danang for VN\$900 per liter. According to same source, Communists were exchanging North Vietnamese money for South Vietnamese piasters at rate of VN\$500 to one North Vietnamese dong.

3. Source also said that based on debriefings of escaped personnel, North Vietnamese had not permitted main force North Vietnamese soldiers into Danang City. Most Communist activity in Danang was being controlled for moment by Communist Viet Cong forces who immediately moved into city on 28 March and began segregating population into three categories, national police and police special branch and senior military officials; middle level GVN civil servants and junior officers in ARVN; and then the lower class and privates and lower ranking non-commissioned officers. These last were released by Communists to begin an exodus to Saigon and other areas under GVN control. Same source said these personnel would provide cover for infiltration of Communist sappers and terrorists into GVN controlled areas as well as spread Communist propaganda on Communist leniency toward captured personnel.—Martin

[Department of State Telegram]

SAIGON.

Subject: NVA/VC treatment of people in recently captured areas.
Ref.: State 4729.

1. Following are several first-person accounts, mostly eye-witnesses, of NVA/VC treatment of people in recently captured areas which were obtained by language qualified Emboff Whu interviewed scores of refugees who reached safety behind GVN lines after fleeing NVA/IH Central Highlands and coastal Lowlands of Mr 1 and Mr 2.

2. The highlands convoy, people who escaped from Phu Sen village, long a VC stronghold (Son Hoa District, Phu Yen) say that RVNAF soldiers captured from the convoy between Phu Tuo District town (Phu Son) and Sun Hoa District town were taken to Phu Sen for detention, rather than leave the necessary number of guards with the soldiers, the NVA shot them through the feet so they could not run away. The number of soldiers was put at "over two hundred".

3. A man from Pleiku said that enemy artillery destroyed a floating bridge just inside Phu Yen near the Phu Bun border before the last third of the convoy—about 100,000 people—were able to cross the rain-swollen river. He had lost track of the date, but believes this occurred on the 23rd or 24th of March. Enemy mortar and recoilless rifle fire continued to pour into the mostly civilian crowd from the rear and both sides, and people at the river's edge were driven into the water by their own panic and by the press of the terrorized crowd behind them. None made it across. The barrage and the river killed several thousand people, the informant said; all of the 100,000 were either killed or captured.

4. The enemy moved in and the fire stopped. While they were trying to separate out soldiers and military age men, and older men from women and children, VNAF fighter-bombers appeared overhead, aware of what was happening, the pilots dropped bombs around the edge of the mass of people. When this failed to defer the enemy's work, they began dropping ordnance in the crowd itself. Again frightened beyond control, they broke and ran into the brush while VC shot and killed as many as they could. Most not killed were recaptured, the man believes; a few like himself got far enough downstream to find a fording place. Most of these died of exhaustion or starvation before they reached Tuy Hoa. He would not estimate how many people died on the banks of the river or in it, saying only "several thousand, several thousand". A nun who was near the front of the convoy now living with her order at regina paols in Saigon said that when the convoy passed near the downstream Qong Cam Dam, soldiers told her the water behind the dam was choked with bodies.

5. An ARVN engineer, part of the team trying to clear the way through the woods for the convoy when mines were struck, recounted the following massacre: the vanguard of the convoy stopped for the night short of Phu Tu Hamlet in Phu Yen, probably about the same time the massacre of the rear has ending at the floating bridge. About a thousand people near the front, most of them civilian families on Hondas, were impatient with the slow progress, driven by desperation, exhaustion, hunger and and the knowledge that they had crossed into the province that held the end of their journey, they snaked their way past the lead ARVN tanks the next morning and, en masse, ran into a VC ambush west of Phu Thu. The group was cut to pieces, despite its obviously being mostly civilian. All men (and most others) not killed were captured and taken

away; the only people left were some women and children, who made it back to the main convoy in terror. It took the main convoy several days to fight its way past this point.

6. Several people from Kontum report that Fr. Cong, one of their priests, was killed on the spot when he walked out in front of a group of his parishioners to talk to Viet Cong who barred their way, somewhere between Pleiku city and Ched Red (Phu Bon).

7. Ban Me Tuot, Tho Truong Hamlet near Ban Me Thuo was people entirely by 1954 refugees from the north, the Hamlet's Pf and Psaf, with no outside help, held out under constant attack until two days after Ban Me Thuothf had fallen. A measure of the enemy's determination there is that six or seven tanks were committed and subsequently destroyed by Pf-fired laws before the Hamlet's ammunition ran out and all resistance disappeared, more enemy tanks rolled in then and shelled the church to rubble. All but a few of the surviving population had taken refuge, and died there. This information is from a woman who ran into the jungle when the fighting started and stayed until it was over.

8. A youth who fled from Ban Me Thuot in the early morning hours of 17 Mar, soon after the attack against the city started, found himself part of a mixed Rvnaf-civilian group of an estimated 5,000 or 6,000 people who were trying to get to the coast.

9. On the 14th, they ran into some enemy soldiers who ordered them to stop but who were too few in number to enforce the order. About a hundred of the group were caught but the rest evaded and gradually re-assembled along the logging road they had been following. Later in the day, in a clearing, they were surrounded by about fifteen Moto-lova trucks that began driving at high speed through the road, the drivers apparently trying to kill as many people as they could. The people broke out of the clearing and into the woods, but not before—according to the young man—about fifty or sixty were killed.

10. Danang two middle-aged men from Danang related the following: on the 28th, 29th and 30th of March, the enemy set up a mortar position near the city side of the Trinh Minh bridge and shelled people massed on the Quat, hoping for evacuation. The usual pattern was 20 to 30 rounds per hour, an hour's pause, and repetition. On the 29th, one of the two men in the crowd said that about fifty people were killed and many more wounded during a half-hour period before he panicked and left.

11. At 0400 on 31 Mar., a young Psaf member returned to a house he shared with two older brothers in the brothers' 303rd Rf battalion dependents compound. An old woman stopped him at the compound gate and told him his brothers were dead and VC were waiting for him inside. He approached the house and fired in the air, two VC ran out and he says he wounded both but they escaped. Inside the house he found both brothers with their throats cut, and his two sister-in-laws bound, gagged and in shock. He took the women and their small children away, and in so doing was told that all Rf soldiers and some dependents caught in the compound had been killed the same way as his brothers. There is information, unconfirmed but considered reliable, that the same thing happened at the 44th Arvn Regiment (23rd division) near Hq and dependents area, near the Ban Me Thuot provincial airfield.

[DEPARTMENT OF STATE TELEGRAM]

SAIGON.

Subj.: NVA/VC Treatment of People in recently captured areas.
Ref.: State.

1. Following information was gathered in

conversation with a Saigon policeman (captain) who has been searching out escaped from Ban Me Thuot to find information about part of his family, presumed captured there. He relates the following events as he heard them from a buddhist monk, who witnessed them.

2. The monks in a Ban Me Thuot Pagoda were accused of helping people hide from the "PRG" (they had in fact sheltered and fed a number of escaped) and were led to the marketplace in Ban Me Thuot, the day after the fighting stopped. Several thousand other people were also assembled there. All were told to sit down. Then local "PRG" cadre walked through the crowd, pointing out GVN employees and police known to them. About 300, according to the monk, were selected and taken off to one side. The presiding cadre delivered a lengthy harangue, accusing them of being American lackeys and spies, and enemies of the people. They were all shot and killed.

3. Next, families of these men known to the local cadres were ordered to follow several armed guards. They were led out of town, and after a short distance the monk (who had been released and was following them out along the road to his pagoda) heard and saw explosions (probably mortars) in the midst of the people. Some were killed, others wounded. They panicked and ran into the woods on both sides, and the monk followed suit. He decided to keep going and, in the company of some others, eventually got to the coast and by boat to Saigon. While waiting for a boat, he found people who had been near the front of the column of dependents and who told him that, after the shelling they saw VC soldiers slightly ahead and to both sides of the column. As the families ran, they were shot at, chased after and shot at again.

4. Apparently, the "PRG" wanted to kill these families, not in executions in front of everyone at the market but as a subtle act of terror to frighten others: men would be persuaded that any anti-"PRG" sentiments would endanger their families as well as themselves. Since the mortar fire began a little early, some of the families managed to escape the ambush. There is no accurate estimate as to how many were killed. Many of those not killed and terrified of staying in Ban Me Thuot any longer may have eventually died somewhere along the foodless two-week trek to the lowlands.

EGG PRODUCERS AND THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have received a letter from Mr. John A. Lait of Cedar Lake, Ind., concerning his analysis of the problems facing egg producers in northwestern Indiana. Like other farmers across our land, egg producers have found themselves caught in a squeeze between the prices they receive for their products and the increased prices they have to pay for all things they purchase. Egg producers, as well as corn, grain, and soybean farmers and cattlemen, are facing difficult problems due to the rapidly escalating costs of production. We as a nation should not ask our farmers to

produce our food and fiber at a financial loss. I commend this letter by Mr. Lait to your attention. The letter is as follows:

LETTER

You honor me in asking for information concerning the shell egg business, and I shall be faithful in discharging this responsibility.

It has been generally reported that egg producers lost 8¢ per dozen in 1974, and they are looking for only a 5¢ loss per dozen in 1975. On the face of these figures, one is tempted not to believe it; however, it is true. How can these egg producers remain in business? For many this will be the last year, and many will continue due to the large investment they have made. Needless to say, these producers must have other sources of revenue, or utilize the loss in other business manipulations.

COST OF PRODUCTION

Feed	Cents per pound	Feed required to produce 1 doz. eggs	
		Pounds	Cents
Cost per ton			
\$148.98 (fall purchased).....	7.5	4.3	0.3215
\$127.00 (cash market).....	6.3	4.3	.2730
			1.297
Cost of pullet: \$2.15, will produce 20 dozen eggs (varies).....			.11
Plant facilities labor, etc.....			.06
Cost to produce a dozen nest-run eggs.....			.467

¹ Cost per dozen.

EGG PRODUCERS

An egg producer who sells his product to egg processors receives an average of 15¢ below the New York price. This date that market is 57¢, or he receives 42¢ per dozen for all eggs sold on a nest-run basis. On a grade-yield basis the processor grades the eggs and pays 11¢ under, but he pays very little for the undergrades. It works out about the same.

The cost of production, less the sale of eggs, leaves him with a 4.7¢ loss per dozen produced. This is for a two-ounce egg "large" size, produced from a flock six months in lay. Consider the loss he has already sustained in producing the smaller sizes of eggs.

Herein, egg processors, lies a different story. He works on the 11 or 15 cents margin. His is just a business of buying and selling. On the grade-yield basis, he is suspected in down grading the eggs to further his margin. Terms like "pencil grading" are prevalent, and his honesty is suspect. Egg processors have had several excellent years in the business, and 1974 was one of the best they have had. His cost is 3¢ per dozen, plus the paper cost of 2 to 4 cents, and his pick up and delivery cost of 2 cents.

Hope springs eternal in the breast of every egg producer, and the "can do" attitude has kept him operating; however, it is apparent that at some point he will no longer exist. The future will be only producer-processor organizations. Then the profit margin will have to level off between the two phases.

In our particular situation, we both produce and process. Our cost is 46.7 cents plus the 3 cents for processing; and we have our eggs available at 49.6 cents. Marketing the eggs then becomes the problem. If we can sell the eggs retail, our margin can be 12¢, or at least 8¢. Inasmuch as we are a complete system, we can sell eggs of many different grades at different margins. Our excess eggs are sold to a large processor in the state of Michigan (this sale is generally at a loss). We are hopeful that enough of our eggs are

sold at retail in order to offset the loss on our excess eggs. If we can ever get to the point where we can sell all of our eggs retail, then we will have a profitable operation.

LEGISLATION

At the present time, Indiana House has a Bill Number 1598, and the Senate has a Bill Number 583, that have passed. The object of these two bills is for the promotion of agricultural products.

The Indiana State Poultry Association, 1975 Legislative Committee, of which I am a member, is seeking the passage of enabling legislation which would allow the poultry industry to hold a referendum in Indiana in regards to a mandatory check-off for promotion, education, etc.

The Federal Trade Commission has a legal action against the National Poultry and Egg Board in reference to advertising against the cholesterol problem.

ITEM

There is growing interest in establishing the post of Secretary of Agriculture in the State of Indiana. As you know, Lt. Gov. Orr is the acting Secretary of Agriculture. If we could get the right man in this spot that would act vigorously and forcefully, this could do much for the furthering of the cause of agriculture. I would like to see him act as a farmer advocate.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Supply and demand have always controlled the egg industry, and a short while ago the annual per capita consumption was 401 eggs. Recently it was reported to be 230 eggs, and falling. As the demand decreases, so must the supply. This means that some producers will have to go out of business. Well and good if that is the proper trend; however, the demand has been tampered with, and the public has been ill advised by the medical profession, and has scared the public with inaccurate information concerning cholesterol. I feel that consumption will fall below the 200 eggs per year if the present trend continues. Consider what will happen then if the American people re-discover the egg as being an excellent source of food, and consume it at the previous rate of 401 eggs per year. The price of eggs would be astronomical, and it would take years to get the supply up to the demand. A real danger lies here, and many of us in the egg industry feel that every effort must be made to inform the public of the truth in the health scare, and keep the supply and demand at its proper level.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussian-Americans recently celebrated the 57th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. It is truly unfortunate that Byelorussia's independence exists only in the minds and hearts of Byelorussians, and not in fact.

In January of 1919, the Soviet Union created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. Since that time, uprisings have occurred expressing the desire of the Byelorussian people for independence.

It is important that we not forget the oppressed peoples of the world, and that we stop to remember the plight of the Byelorussian people.

ASKS UNITED STATES TO INVITE ALEXANDER DUBCEK TO THIS COUNTRY

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us admire and respect courage in the cause of human rights and freedom.

Therefore, I hope all members of this House will support my request that our Government extend an invitation to Alexander Dubcek of Czechoslovakia to come to live in the United States.

Alexander Dubcek, to refresh your memory, was head of the Czechoslovakian Government which relaxed some of the harsh restrictions on human liberty usually found in a Communist state.

You may remember how the entire free world was jolted in 1968 when Russian tanks and troops rumbled into Prague and extinguished this flame of freedom.

Once again, the darkness of repression—the rejection of freedom—the refusal to permit free speech and discussion—had fallen on Czechoslovakia.

Frankly, I was especially disturbed about this because Czechoslovakia is the land of my ancestors. Like millions of other Americans, while completely loyal to this country and fully appreciative of its opportunities and advantages, I have a certain sentimental attachment to my heritage.

After the night of repression fell on Czechoslovakia again, Alexander Dubcek became a virtual prisoner. He and his family were subjected to constant surveillance. He was assigned to work as an auto mechanic.

But he continued to speak out in favor of greater freedom for his countrymen.

This week, news dispatches reported that the present Communist government of Czechoslovakia had told Alexander Dubcek to either shut up or leave the country.

In other words, this outspoken courageous man is threatened with expulsion from his native land.

I totally disagree with Mr. Dubcek's commitment to communism, but I concur in his dedication to certain fundamental human rights.

I have sent the following letter to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger:

I herewith request that the United States extend an immediate official invitation to Alexander Dubcek to take up residence in this country.

Mr. Dubcek became a symbol of freedom when, as First Secretary of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, he liberalized the regime and recognized the human rights of the people of his country. His liberal policies were suspended when Soviet tanks rumbled into Prague in 1968.

Since then, Mr. Dubcek has continued to speak out courageously in favor of human rights and freedom.

Although I strongly disagree with his dedication to the cause of Communism, I respect and admire his devotion to the concept of human freedom.

Since the overthrow of his government in

1968, Mr. Dubcek has been a virtual prisoner in Czechoslovakia. Despite constant surveillance and restrictions, he has continued to speak out in favor of freedom for the individual. This man who once headed his nation has been assigned to work as an auto mechanic.

Gustav Husak, present leader of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, announced yesterday that his authoritarian regime would permit Dubcek to leave Czechoslovakia.

I request that the United States Government immediately make it clear that Mr. Dubcek would be welcomed in this country. His arrival here would demonstrate to the world that the United States is still the land of the free to which people throughout the planet can look as a beacon and hope for a future of freedom.

An invitation to Mr. Dubcek to find sanctuary here would confirm American's moral leadership of the free world.

I hope Dr. Kissinger will take quick and affirmative action on this proposal.

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERS RELIEF ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the most recent report from the Joint Economic Committee states that this country is now experiencing its highest rate of unemployment since 1941. There were 8 million persons unemployed in the month of March, 500,000 above the previous month and 3.1 million above August 1974, when joblessness began its rapid climb. The March increase in joblessness was shared by virtually all worker groups. Rates were near or above alltime highs for adult women, 8.5 percent; teenagers, 20.6 percent; whites, 8 percent; blacks, 14.2 percent; household heads, 5.8 percent; and full-time workers, 8.3 percent.

For my State of Connecticut, the unemployment level in February was 9.5 percent. In the eastern part of the State which I represent, double-digit unemployment predominates, with 10.6 percent in Norwich; 15.4 percent in Putnam; 22.9 percent in Plainfield; 5 percent in New London; 8.9 percent in Vernon; 10 percent in Willimantic; and 10.4 percent in Middletown. Needless to say, the loss of jobs reflected in these unemployment figures is causing serious economic problems in Connecticut and the entire country. One of the most serious is the loss of income to cover home mortgage payments, which leads to the ultimate foreclosure on the home and the loss of what is, in most cases, a lifetime investment.

H.R. 5398 which has been passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate would provide repayable emergency mortgage relief payments to homeowners unable to make mortgage payments due to current economic conditions. Under the provisions of the bill, the homeowner must have suffered a severe reduction in income due to involuntary unemployment or underemployment due to current economic conditions. Payments provided by HUD under this legislation may be in an amount up to the amount of the principal, interest, taxes, grounds rents,

hazard insurance and mortgage insurance premiums due under the mortgage, but may not exceed the lesser of \$250 per month or the amount determined to be necessary to supplement such amount as the homeowner is capable of contributing toward his mortgage.

I cosponsored an earlier version of this legislation because of the great number of people it will assist in safeguarding the investment they have made in their homes. The bill authorizes a total of \$500 million for 1976 through fiscal year 1979, a level which would assist a total of 300,000 homeowners. I would like to emphasize that these mortgage payments provided by HUD under this legislation are loans, and must be paid back on terms and conditions set by HUD but at an interest rate no greater than 8 percent. HUD is required to obtain adequate security for the relief payments, including, if necessary, a lien on the mortgaged property. With these provisions written into this legislation, the enactment of H.R. 5398 would not be inflationary and, in fact, would help stabilize our economy during this recessionary period. Without these benefits, thousands of persons may lose their homes and be forced to seek public assistance, creating an additional tax burden on the working population.

In addition, this legislation will benefit our economy by preventing disruption of residential markets and construction activity because of distress sales of homes and by maintaining normal mortgage lending activity of financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy and hardship of this economic recession has been widespread and many people have suffered greatly. Often, our view of what is needed to bring us out of our current economic difficulties becomes clouded. However, we can be certain that, without the assistance which this legislation would extend to unemployed and underemployed citizens, many people will be unable to meet their mortgage payments and will lose their homes. The Emergency Homeowners Relief Act would prevent these tragedies from occurring, and will not have inflationary impact on the economy.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF KATYN MASSACRES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Aloysius A. Mazewski, the distinguished President of the Polish National Alliance who lives in the 11th Congressional District I am privileged to represent, spoke April 13 at a memorial program sponsored by the alliance in commemoration of the Polish victims of the brutal Soviet massacre in the Katyn Forest during the spring of 1940.

It is most fitting that we honor the memory of those courageous victims for as Mr. Mazewski points out we must learn the lessons taught by this monstrous atrocity and stand firm against continu-

ing Soviet attempts to enslave the free peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Mazewski's remarks and include them in the RECORD at this point.

SPEECH OF ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI

The Katyn Forest massacre of 4,423 Polish intellectuals—among them two generals, hundreds of scientists, doctors, professors, chaplains, judges, lawyers, engineers and students, remains as the last unpunished and largest ignored crime of genocide committed during World War Two. It was a part of the savage plan to deprive the Polish nation of its intellectual leadership.

The Katyn Massacre was not "just another war atrocity" executed in the blind fury of a battlefield. It was a premeditated, and long planned mass murder and should have been classified as a crime against humanity and brought to the docket of the International Wars Crimes Tribunal in Nuremberg.

It was conveniently overlooked by the Western Powers in order to placate the Soviet Union.

Then in 1951, the House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Massacre, after a thorough investigation, formally accused Russia of the Katyn crime and asked the State Department to present the case to the United Nations. Here, again, it was deemed "inopportune" to offend the Soviet Union with incontrovertible facts. We owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman Ray J. Madden, Chairman, former Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan and Roman Pucinski, and others, for their steadfast and relentless investigation.

Eugene Lyons, then roving editor of Readers' Digest, pointed accusing finger at the Western Powers when he wrote:

"Since Soviet Russia was an ally in the war against Germany—neither the United States nor Great Britain cared to look into the unsavory Katyn Forest facts. It was more convenient to accept Moscow lies and forget the matter".

Thus, the Katyn Massacre, one of the most shocking, cold-blooded crimes against humanity, committed during World War Two by totalitarian systems—is gather dust in our State Department and in other chancelleries of the free world.

This incomprehensible fear of offending the Soviet Union and its corollary—the naive, almost childish desire to accommodate the Russians in every area of international relations, persists throughout the decades of post war era.

There is no quid pro quo in American dealings with the Soviet Union.

All the Kremlin tyrants need to do in a dispute is to show truculency to win unwarranted accommodations from American diplomacy.

That was the way we lost the peace after winning the war. The Soviet Union expanded its tyranny and enslaved half of Europe in its Communist system.

Years of the cold war and Russian intransigence did not bring home the lesson, that the only thing the Russians respect is the show of power and determination.

Today, we have a new case in point.

Dr. Kissinger, whose personal diplomacy and shuttle forms of negotiations more and more appear as houses of cards built on the quicksands of history, allegedly promised the Soviet Union a new unwarranted concession during the planning of the Helsinki Conference on European Peace and Security.

It was the promise to formally recognize and accept by the United States the Soviet Union's war time annexation of the Baltic States and their summary incorporation in the Soviet empire.

The United States has been steadfast in non-recognition of this Russian conquest.

Thanks to the alertness and investigative zeal of the American press, this alleged promise Secretary of State Kissinger made to the Russians, became known to the general public. In the light of publicity it appeared as another one-sided concession to the Russians.

Recently, while discussing Congressional reluctance in providing further aid to South Viet Nam, Dr. Kissinger asked: —what kind of people are we?

The same question with even more relevancy can be applied to the luckily aborted plan of forsaking the Baltic people to the merciless tyranny of the Soviet Union.

What kind of people does Dr. Kissinger think we are?

Are we willing to condone the cynical, unwarranted and unrewarding abandonment of historic rights of entire nations, just to keep the Russians less truculent at the Helsinki negotiations?

And by what right did Dr. Kissinger attempt to seal the fate of the Baltic States?

The timely exposure of the American press of this autocratic promise saved the United States from a grievous international error.

Learning about it from the press and the spokesmen of the Baltic States, President Ford firmly stated that no such concession will be presented to the Russians at Helsinki.

And Dr. Kissinger may learn a valuable lesson. Namely, that the Russians will not withdraw from the international conference on this account and may become more civilized and reasonable when they find out that their theatrical truculence does not pay off.

There is also a talk about liquidating Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to make it easier for the Moscow tyrants and their pro-consuls in the subjugated nations to suppress truth and extinguish the last remaining rays for hope for cultural and political freedom.

To this nefarious attempt I say:—we will be first to cheer the dissolution of the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty facilities, if such a dissolution would herald the restoration of the freedom of expression in the East and Central European countries, now dominated by the Soviet Union, and if a measure of personal freedom for the Russian people was the exchange value on the part of Moscow.

Under the present circumstances, however, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are indispensable sources of objective information for the subjugated nations.

BAN THE HANDGUN—NO. 7

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when Attorney General Levi announced the outline of a Justice Department proposal for handgun control on April 6, he added fuel to the already flaming controversy over the handgun issue. Many of us find the proposal much too weak; others, of course, believe that any Federal control over handguns is unacceptable.

I was pleased that the Ford administration decided to address the problem, but disappointed with the chosen approach. While Mr. Levi's idea is innovative, it will also be ineffective if enacted into law. In the Attorney General's own eloquent words, a handgun is "a mechanism that translates passion or passing evil intent into destruction." Although he clearly recognizes the menace posed by

the availability of handguns, his proposal would do little to counter that menace.

On April 17, the Washington Post offered cogent criticism of the Attorney General's proposal. A description of the proposal, from April 7th's New York Times, and the Post editorial appear below:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1975]

LEVI SAYS UNITED STATES IS STUDYING WAYS TO CURB PISTOLS IN URBAN AREAS

(By John M. Crewdson)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—Attorney General Edward H. Levi said today that the Justice Department was considering a number of proposals that would reduce or eliminate the possession of pistols in metropolitan areas.

In a speech before the Law Enforcement Executives Narcotics Conference here, Mr. Levi outlined the measures that he said he believed might stem further increases in the estimated national supply of more than 40 million pistols and prohibit their possession in high crime areas outside the home or place of business.

The pistol, he said, "makes an individual in a city too powerful for his environment. It is a menace because it can be so readily hidden. It is a mechanism that translates passion or passing evil intent into destruction."

State, local and Federal laws regulating the impact and sale of pistols, the Attorney General said, "have proven to be insufficient" in affecting the "great carnage" and "even greater anxiety" he laid to their use.

MENTIONED AT CONFERENCE

At a news conference last week, Mr. Levi mentioned gun control as an example of the kind of social issue that he said ought not to be "swept under a rug" by society only to be "dragged out before a court" on a case-by-case basis and then resolved in an adversary proceeding.

He said that he had recently discussed the department's gun control study with President Ford, who "encouraged us to go ahead" with the attempt to find some mechanism that could be put into a legislative proposal.

One remedy under discussion within the Justice Department, Mr. Levi said today, is a system of taxes on "Saturday night specials"—cheap, low-quality pistols—that would "price this variety of weapon out of existence."

Mr. Levi cited a Treasury Department study showing that 70 per cent of more than 4,500 pistols used in crimes in four major cities were "Saturday night specials."

The Justice Department, he said, believed that an effective test could be devised to define such weapons "with sufficient clarity," based on such factors as size, barrel length and the metallurgical quality of the weapon.

One approach under consideration, he said, which would reduce the attractiveness of such weapons to potential purchasers, involves a "graduated tax" that would bring the price of each cheap pistol up to "some specified level," such as \$100.

Mr. Levi pointed out, however, that "Saturday night specials are not the only weapons on the street," and that a prohibitive tax or even an outright ban on their manufacture or sale would not eliminate the threat caused by other pistols, cheap or expensive.

A second approach therefore under consideration, he said, involves the prohibition of the possession of any pistol outside the home or place of business if the local violent crime rate should rise above a certain level.

STATISTICAL AREA

As an example, Mr. Levi suggested that such a ban should take effect if the violent crime rate in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area was either 20 per cent higher than the national average or 10 per cent higher than the national average and 5 per

cent higher than the previous year's local rate.

A Metropolitan Statistical Area is defined as a central city of 50,000 or more inhabitants and its surrounding political subdivisions.

Mr. Levi said that, under his suggested criteria, a Federal pistol prohibition law would have been put into effect in 62 such areas, including New York City, Washington, Chicago, Baltimore, San Francisco and Los Angeles.

Although Mr. Levi's address gave no clue as to the sort of proposal his department would ultimately recommend for translation into Federal law, he seemed to prefer the second approach of prohibiting street possession in high crime areas.

Such an approach, he said, "would avoid the problem encountered in so many cities whose neighboring suburbs do not control handguns strictly."

In addition, he said, it would "leave unaffected the use of handguns in vast areas of the nation, in cities where violence has not reached emergency proportions and in rural areas where handgun use is both less threatening and more legitimate."

GUNS

Attorney General Edward H. Levi has taken an important step in the debate over the control of this country's proliferating store of handguns. In a recent speech to law enforcement officials, the new Attorney General made it clear he believes some form of handgun control is in order. That is a marked departure in viewpoint from that of his recent predecessors. The conventional wisdom has held in the past that the subject is so controversial that it is best avoided.

The need for handgun control is pressing, as each day's news readily demonstrates. One day we learn of a dramatic suicide, the next of a deranged man who walked along a highway looking for black faces. Each time he saw one, he fired a .45 caliber automatic at pointblank range, killing two and badly wounding four other motorists and their passengers.

Despite such incidents and the other compelling evidence of the need to stop a civilian arms race that results in the sale of 2.5 million new handguns a year, there are still powerful forces able to raise a political hue and cry at the suggestion these weapons should be controlled. Mr. Levi recognized that powerful lobby when he said: "The test of our government may lie in its ability to open thoughtful discussion on issues marked by deep emotional divisions." In the past, those divisions have been sufficiently emotional to keep those who should be speaking out from doing so.

Mr. Levi placed much of his emphasis on the problem of urban crime, arguing correctly that "a handgun makes an individual in a city too powerful for his environment." He went on to propose a complex remedy that is highly questionable in practical terms.

Mr. Levi has proposed what amounts to a gun-free zone. He would try to cast legislation in such a way as to make handguns illegal in high-crime urban areas while leaving undisturbed the present gun sale and ownership patterns in rural areas and those urban areas with significantly lower crime rates than the large cities. There are a number of reasons this will not work. To begin with, if we take the street sale of heroin as an analogy, Mr. Levi's model would say that there is no point in making possession and sale a federal offense in South Carolina, because South Carolina has no demonstrated heroin problem. Such a suggestion with regard to heroin would satisfy no one, and little more could be expected of such a plan with respect to guns.

The evidence suggests there is no way to use the law to create walls around juris-

dictions. In fact, a study of several thousand guns seized from criminals in New York City in 1973 showed just that. Those guns were traced back to a small sporting goods store in South Carolina, a store that had become a major source of underworld fire power in New York. New York has one of the toughest guns laws in the Nation, and the oldest. It is, in effect, the very gun-free zone Mr. Levi is suggesting. Aside from private guards, only about 8,000 New Yorkers are legally entitled to carry guns. Yet, gun crime is climbing at an alarming rate in that city. The guns come from areas of the country, particularly the South, where there is almost no gun crime problem.

Focusing on the problem of high-crime areas ignores the damage done to people all over the country, because of the ill-advised possession of handguns. There is no piecemeal solution to the handgun problem. There is no one kind of gun which, once outlawed, will make the problem less serious. No one, two or dozen places can be isolated for legislative treatment. We need a national, comprehensive gun control law that banishes the handgun from all parts of the Nation. Nothing else will do the job. While applauding his courage in taking on the problem, we would urge Mr. Levi to give further thought to the question of what is the right remedy.

PONTIAC, MICH., TURNS TIDE ON CRIME

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, historically, the city of Pontiac, Mich., has had the rather dubious distinction of claiming the second highest crime rate among cities its size in the United States. Now, thanks to an ambitious crime prevention program made possible by Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funding and the hard work of private citizens and public officials, Pontiac is shedding the image of a high crime community.

In 1974 crimes against persons actually decreased by 11.7 percent in Pontiac, from nearly 2,000 the year before to just over 1,700. This figure becomes even more impressive when compared to the 15 percent rise in such crime across the Nation—for comparable cities—and the 13.6-percent rise for the rest of Michigan. Although the total crime index rose by 10.5 percent in Pontiac in 1974, this figure is considerably less than the national rise of 18 percent and the statewide rise of 23.4 percent.

The reason behind this dramatic crime-fighting success is the comprehensive crime prevention program, a program developed by the city manager's task force on crime prevention and implemented with the support of LEAA funds.

Ten project areas have been developed as a result of the work of the task force, including the establishment of a permanent citizens crime prevention advisory committee to continue the efforts of the task force. A school outreach program has been implemented to foster positive interaction between the police and ele-

mentary and secondary school students, and police officers have assumed counselor roles in schools to further improve these relations.

Other projects include:

A building security team program designed to provide advice and recommendations to individual citizens on how to make their homes and businesses secure from robberies and burglaries.

A neighborhood citizens watch program designed to supplement regular police patrols in residential areas by providing for volunteer "citizen watches" to report crimes or suspicious circumstances to police.

A street lighting improvement program designed to reduce potential criminal acts in locations where conventional street lighting is inadequate for crime detection.

A court administration reorganization program designed to improve and facilitate the activities of the 50th district court.

An improved court probation program designed to provide meaningful probationary services to persons convicted of crimes in Pontiac.

A silent observer program designed to elicit information from citizens with knowledge of the identities of crime perpetrators, through a system of monetary rewards.

A major project area has been the reorganization, and reallocation of resources, of the Pontiac Police Department under the leadership of Police Chief William K. Hanger. Platoons have been beefed up in relation to call-load volumes with the goal of responding to serious calls within 2 minutes at least 95 percent of the time. Patrol sectors have been realigned for more effective coverage, and the investigations division has been reorganized to help increase the conviction rate. The result has been a rise in the crime clearance rate from 14 percent to 48 percent, and a rise in the conviction rate from 58 percent to 84.4 percent.

Pontiac's comprehensive effort in the area of crime prevention utilizes the concept that just as crime itself is not the result of a single factor, effective crime prevention cannot be realized with isolated tactics. Mayor Wallace Holland has stated:

The central theme running through Pontiac's approach has been to present as broad an effort as possible and to probe as many crime producing factors as money and manpower will permit.

The statistics prove that this comprehensive approach has been highly effective, and the city of Pontiac is much the better for it. Many people deserve credit for this successful fight on crime; City Manager Frank Smiley and his office's task force, Mayor Holland and the city commissioners, Chief Hanger, and others. But city officials are unanimous in their belief that the major ingredient for success was, and is, the presence of LEAA funding. Still, it is certainly to their credit that they have made the most effective use of these funds, and I am pleased to report of their accomplishments in this area.

BUCKING A NATIONAL HOUSING TREND

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a widely acknowledged fact that we face a national housing crisis. Housing production has drastically declined placing an added burden not only on the housing market, but on the already strained economy as well.

To a large degree, this crisis has been caused by an abdication of leadership on the part of both the present administration and its predecessor. The housing moratorium imposed in January of 1973, which for all intent and purpose is still in effect, has dealt a crushing blow to the hopes of many who took us at our word when the Congress committed this country to the housing goals set forth in the 1968 Housing Act. The direct impact of the moratorium can be measured in the dramatic decline in housing starts since 1973. The crippling economic effects caused by the moratorium are best measured in the growing unemployment lines across the country.

We are asked to believe that existing Federal housing programs such as sections 235 and 236 were inefficient, wasteful, and unworkable. Past production levels and quiet successes across the country, however, refute these claims.

The following article, written by Bill White, executive director of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency and a trusted friend, documents a successful integration of these Federal housing programs and those undertaken by Massachusetts under his leadership. The article, which appeared in the March issue of *Urban Land*, suggests that the existing Federal housing programs can and do work when properly administered, and that they should not be hastily shelved or replaced by untried programs. The article follows:

MIXED-INCOME HOUSING IN MASSACHUSETTS—BUCKING A NATIONAL TREND

It has been generally assumed in this country that the residential integration of different economic and social groups is not possible. The historical basis of this assumption is subject to question, but there is no doubt that the idea has pervaded the housing development industry throughout the twentieth century. Relatively homogeneous housing in the same price range has traditionally been thought to be the key to a successful neighborhood.

Government involvement in housing has repeatedly been based on this assumption and has reinforced it over time. As early as the 1920s, with the enactment of zoning regulations, government supplied the legal basis for development of economically stratified neighborhoods.

In 1943 Congress authorized the federal government to conduct an experimental program of slum clearance and construction of public housing projects for poor people in cities. The Housing Act of 1937 authorized a public housing program and shifted the operational responsibility for it to the cities. Cost limitations restricting the design of buildings and income limits governing occupancy ensured that only the very poor

would live in the projects. Residents with rising incomes were forced to leave their homes and seek shelter in the private market.

Whereas the public housing program was designed for the urban poor, construction of single-family houses was encouraged in the suburbs. The FHA insurance program made it possible for families who would otherwise have been unable to obtain a mortgage loan to purchase houses. The homeowners also received an indirect government subsidy based on the deduction of interest payments from the household's taxable income. This policy of publicly-owned projects in the cities and privately-owned houses in the suburbs was the core of the government's housing program throughout the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s.

The stratification of income groups was also encouraged by the urban renewal program begun in 1949. Cities were authorized to take land, demolish buildings, and convey the sites to private developers who would replace the older, low-rent buildings with luxury housing. This created upper-income enclaves in the cities. Legislative refinements in the urban renewal program eliminated some of the inequities in the process, but the policy of building housing for a specific income group continued.

New programs introduced in the 1950s and 1960s extended government-assisted housing to moderate-income groups who were unqualified to live in public housing and unable to afford market rents or homeownership. Section 221(d)(3) and, later, Section 236, were added to the lexicon of programs aimed at specific income groups. Following the federal government's model, some states and cities enacted their own programs. Housing finance agencies authorized to make below-market interest rate loans were established.

In a few instances urban renewal programs were planned for a combination of income groups. But these were cautious experiments where separate buildings were designed for the specific income groups that would inhabit them. Such an "income mix" consisted of luxury housing at high rents on one site, moderate-income housing meeting the standards of Section 221(d)(3) or 236 on a second parcel, and public housing for low-income households on the remaining and, inevitably, least desirable piece of land in the urban renewal area.

In some cases these efforts provided replacement housing for the people displaced by the renewal process, but they did little to achieve integration of socio-economic groups. Instead of encouraging interaction, site planning tended to establish physical barriers separating different groups. Furthermore, design of the buildings and living units deliberately demonstrated that each building was for a different clientele.

As a result of the government housing policy, the residential patterns of the American people became increasingly segregated by income. Moreover, segregation by race was reinforced and extended. The low and moderate-income households which make up a disproportionate percentage of the black population were limited in their housing opportunities to a choice between older housing, often substandard, and new housing projects for low-income or moderate-income households. Minority groups were even excluded from some of the new projects. It took an executive order from President Kennedy in 1962 to outlaw discrimination in federally-aided housing.

Government policies had a disastrous effect on minority group families who could afford to buy a house in the suburbs. Between 1935 and 1950 discriminatory practices were not only condoned but actively encouraged by government agencies. Charles Abrams, in *The City is the Frontier*, said:

"The Federal Housing Administration's official

manuals cautioned against 'infiltration of inharmonious racial and national groups,' 'a lower class of inhabitants,' or the 'presence of incompatible racial elements' in the new neighborhoods. . . . Zoning was advocated as a device for exclusion, and the use was urged of a racial covenant (prepared by the FHA itself) with a space left blank for the prohibited races and religions, to be filled in by the builder as occasion required. The Home Loan Bank System—the federal agency which regulates savings and loan associations—urged similar practices.

For some sixteen years, then—a period in which more than 11 million homes were built—federal housing agencies pursued a concerted, relentless, and officially sanctioned drive to keep people living only with their own kind and to get them to oppose intrusion by anybody who was different."

In 1950, two years after the Supreme Court held the covenants to be unenforceable, the FHA manual was revised on orders from President Truman.

Considerable support for racial integration can be found in the sociological literature on housing, but most studies stop short of suggesting that economic integration is workable. In 1970 the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development asked for an examination of the subject. A Social Science Panel was created and charged with drawing together and assessing the behavioral and social science knowledge bearing on the feasibility and desirability of a policy of social mixing. The summary report entitled *Freedom of Choice in Housing: Opportunities and Constraints*, published in 1972, said:

"There is no evidence from field studies that socioeconomic mixing is feasible. The trend in the movements of urban population is toward increasing separation of socioeconomic categories. The tendency is manifested among blacks as well as whites."

Given the history of the nation's housing policies it is no surprise that the separation of socioeconomic categories is increasing. But to say that a trend sets the limits of feasibility is to suggest that this is the best of all possible worlds.

In a paper prepared for the Social Science Panel on "Social Stratification in Urban Areas," Cora B. Marrett questions the idea that low-income people desire to live only with their own economic group.

"Recognition that low-income residents have not consciously chosen to live in homogeneous communities is essential. Measures that widen their options may disclose a rather different pattern of preference than that previously evident."

But with respect to middle and upper-income people, the assumption that people prefer homogeneous communities goes unchallenged.

The absence of evidence that socioeconomic mixing is feasible is due to the fact that, until recently, no public policy of encouraging a socioeconomic mixture of residents in a neighborhood has been tried.

The creation of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency was the first legislative act to establish a clear public policy of encouraging the economic and racial integration of housing. The MHFA statute, passed in 1966 and amended in 1968, requires that 25 percent of the dwelling units in each development financed by the Agency be made available to low-income persons. The intent of the law is to promote the creation of low-income housing that is well-designed and well-managed. The need for public support of this goal is expressed in Section 2 of the law:

"Private enterprise, without the assistance contemplated in this act, cannot achieve the construction of decent, safe and sanitary housing at rentals which persons and families of low income can afford in situations where permanent betterment of living con-

ditions is to be hoped for. Moreover, experience has demonstrated that concentration of low income persons and families even in standard structures built with public subsidy does not eliminate undesirable social conditions and does not permanently eliminate slum conditions."

In June 1969 the Supreme Judicial Court upheld the constitutionality of the Agency. The members and staff, fully committed to the successful development of the concept, began to finance mixed-income housing and to create the policies that would make it work.

From the beginning it was clear that MHFA-financed housing would have to be designed to compete in the private market for the middle-income residents who could afford the unsubsidized rents. By extending the same design and management quality throughout the development the Agency believed it would be able to fulfill its purpose of increasing the supply of good housing for households of low and moderate income.

MHFA's power consists in its ability to raise mortgage money through the sale of notes and bonds at tax-exempt interest rates and to lend the funds at below-market interest rates to private developers who agree to limit the profits they derive from the housing they build.

By the time MHFA had become operational, however, the costs of land and construction had grown apace. The Agency's tools were no longer adequate to meet the needs of low-income people. Even rent skewing, where a reduction in rents for 25 percent of the units is matched by an increase in rents for the market-rate units, was insufficient to reach households with incomes below the limits set for occupancy of public housing. And such a system would leave moderate-income people out in the cold.

For this reason MHFA turned to HUD for the rent supplements and public housing leasing money which would reduce rents for low-income residents and for the interest reduction funds through Section 236 of the National Housing Act which would serve the moderate-income households.

MHFA and HUD together created a flexible system for incorporating these funds into our developments without identifying which dwelling units would be inhabited by low, moderate, or middle-income households.

HUD also agreed to recognize MHFA processing of loan applications, a policy which prevented the duplication of red tape and saved years in processing time. HUD set aside funds that would be used only in housing financed by MHFA. This enabled the Agency to know in advance the level of production which would be possible.

In 1970 this system seemed to be a major breakthrough in the way government agencies do business with each other. In retrospect it is clear that its success resulted from the commitment of HUD officials in Washington, in the New England Regional Office, and in the Boston Area Office to produce well-designed, well-managed housing as rapidly as possible.

MHFA closed its first loan in January 1970. By the end of 1974 the Agency had financed 178 housing developments containing 26,575 dwelling units with loans totalling \$604,337,076. Seventy-six percent of these developments are occupied; the remainder are under construction. In addition, more than \$300,000,000 has been committed to finance approximately 11,500 units for low, moderate, and middle-income people.

The category of low income, defined by local housing authorities, varies from one municipality to another. Generally speaking, it means an income of less than \$6,000 a year and includes families receiving public assistance and elderly persons living on a social security budget. The moderate-income

group, again speaking generally, consists of households with income between \$6,000 and \$12,000 a year. Middle-income households paying the market rent may have incomes as high as \$30,000 a year.

From the start of the program it was obvious that the selection of good sites would be a crucial first step in the production of successful mixed-income housing. A policy was established to accept only those sites where people, regardless of their income, would choose to live.

On the average, MHFA accepts one out of three sites proposed by private developers. As a result of this selectivity, MHFA housing is now situated in excellent physical and social environments in the best locations of cities, suburbs, and towns and in urban areas that show promise of improving.

MHFA also insists on good design. To avoid a stereotyped product the Agency requires an original design for each development that is financed. Plans for undeveloped sites seek to preserve the natural contours of the land and save as many trees as possible. In urban areas buildings are planned to relate well to their surroundings.

Great care is taken in arranging the buildings on the land to preserve open space and provide adequate recreational facilities, attractive landscaping, reasonable traffic patterns, and unobtrusive parking areas. The layouts of the residential units, community spaces, and public areas are designed with the daily needs of the residents in mind. Building materials of the highest quality are required.

The analysis of mortgage applications stresses the importance of operating budgets sufficient to support proper maintenance and management. Management policies are structured to promote the goal of economic integration; residents paying low, moderate, and market rents are mixed throughout the development. No distinctions are made in the quality of dwelling units for different income groups. All residents have equal access to the community spaces, social activities, day care centers, swimming pools, and tennis courts. Limited amenities, such as the best views, are distributed among the different income groups on a proportional basis.

These management policies are taken into account early in the site planning stage of the design review process.

From the beginning of the Agency's activity, we have been driven by the belief that what we are doing is socially and philosophically right. We found the concept to be acceptable in the marketplace. Our units rented well and developers became increasingly interested in the program. They, too, found that it works.

But as a public agency with responsibilities and obligations to the larger community, MHFA decided to sponsor a factual analysis by a source outside the Agency to measure the effectiveness of the program.

In early 1973 we developed a procedure to find a study team of the highest caliber to do a social audit of the MHFA program which would evaluate how well the socioeconomic mixture of residents is working.

A team of researchers was assembled under the direction of four housing experts: Dr. William Ryan, professor and chairman of the Psychology Department of Boston College; Alan Sloan, a housing specialist on leave for the duration of the study from Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Dr. Mania Seferia, a social psychologist and associate professor of City Planning at the Harvard Graduate School of Design; and Elaine Werby, formerly chief of Social Planning at the Boston Housing Authority.

The social audit team was given complete independence during the year-long study to investigate all aspects of the central question: does the MHFA mixed-income program work? How does the level of satisfaction of

tenants of mixed-income housing compare with that of residents of housing that has a narrow range of income groups?

The question was complicated by the presence of factors other than income mix that affect levels of satisfaction. Random distribution of these characteristics could not be assumed, because some architects, builders, and managers consistently perform better than others. So the first task of the social audit team was to construct a research model that could be used to measure and control the other factors which affect satisfaction and, thereby, judge the independent effect of income and racial mix.

The model that was developed includes a number of objective and subjective variables such as location, design and construction, management practices, maintenance quality, and the characteristics of the resident population. It was assumed that each variable might be correlated with satisfaction and that the variables might be intercorrelated as well. Thus, the social audit asked the question: what are the determinants of satisfaction and, within the pattern of these determinants, what is the particular effect of income mix?

The team studied the first wave of MHFA production: 16 housing developments, the 3,200 households living in them, and the municipalities in which they are located. Interviews were held with developers, architects, managers, and municipal officials. The social audit team selected an outside group to evaluate the design and construction of the housing.

Intensive interviews were conducted with 200 MHFA tenants and with 125 residents of similar developments which house a more homogeneous population. These included publicly-owned housing for low-income households, moderate-income housing developed through Sections 221 (d) (3) and 236 of the National Housing Act, and market-rent housing financed by conventional sources.

The residents' own expressions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their apartments, housing developments, management, and neighbors were studied to determine whether the income and racial mixture are working.

We were delighted with the outcome of the study, which we believe has major national importance. The social audit found that mixed-income housing developments produce greater satisfaction at all income levels than do homogeneous housing developments which are either traditionally-subsidized or conventionally-financed.

The principal reason for the difference, according to the social audit, is that MHFA developments are superior in design, construction, and management. The study concludes that:

"... income mix 'works' or does not 'work' according to whether the mix occurs in well-designed, well-constructed, well-managed developments. These latter factors are the crucial determinants of satisfaction. Income mix and racial mix are, in themselves, of no particular relevance."

The report states that MHFA tenants expressed an unequivocally higher level of satisfaction, a total of 89 percent satisfied and only 11 percent dissatisfied compared to the non-MHFA tenants, who were 78 percent satisfied and 22 percent dissatisfied. These differences are statistically very significant.

In addition to reporting higher overall satisfaction, MHFA tenants showed higher satisfaction with their apartments, with their developments as a whole, and with management. This higher satisfaction is also found in an analysis of responses from each income group, including the market-rent tenants.

A very important finding by the social audit team is that:

"... contrary to conventional wisdom, people at different income levels display pretty much the same distribution of values,

social attitudes, and life styles. Thus, the major theoretical reason for predicting difficulties around extensive income mixing—a dysfunctional clash in values and behavior—is probably based on misinformation.”

The report also pointed to ways for MHFA to make improvements in its program. By ranking the 16 early developments according to the tenants’ level of overall satisfaction, the study shows that several developments with less satisfied tenants (although more satisfied than the control group of non-MHFA tenants) could be classified as “traditional subsidized” housing.

These developments are set apart from those in the superior categories by several interrelated factors: they are predominantly subsidized, are located in poorer communities, and exhibit less successful design, construction, and management. The key factor in making this housing less successful in producing tenant satisfaction, according to the report, is the attitude of the developer that he is building a “traditional 236” all-subsidized development.

In contrast, the superior developments achieve a startlingly high level of tenant satisfaction as a direct function of the developer’s intention to create housing which will compete successfully in the open market. But the report stresses that although these superior developments produce more satisfaction for tenants, they are not meeting the same magnitude of social needs as the “traditional subsidized” developments.

The report recommends that MHFA strive for a blend of the essential ingredients of the superior developments (development teams and sites that are geared to attract market tenants) with more attention to meeting the needs of large families and members of minority groups.

The study found that in the first wave of MHFA production significant changes in the patterns of racial segregation were not made; that “although some movement toward greater integration is evident, the pattern of racial distribution in MHFA developments is only moderately different from that in the general housing market.”

Before MHFA had the conclusions of the social audit in hand we had already stepped up our efforts to monitor the affirmative marketing performance of the owners and managers of developments financed by us. We also instituted a practice of holding open some units until we were convinced that every conceivable step to achieve a racial mixture of residents had been taken.

The social audit report reinforced our belief in the wisdom of racial as well as economic integration. The study concludes that:

“... for the individual, his expressed satisfaction with the development he lives in is associated with his evaluative reactions to the development itself and the way the management operates... (With regard to his neighbors) he is happier if they are friendly and well-behaved, but group characteristics appear to be irrelevant. In particular his own perception of how much income mix and how many minority families there are in the development has no association one way or another with his own personal level of satisfaction.”

“(In the interviews) there were three questions asking, in general, whether in housing developments there should be social mixing or social similarity, that is, asking whether, with respect to race, age, and income, people should be different, the same, or it didn’t matter. With regard to these three options the most commonly chosen response was that it didn’t matter (30 percent). Thirty-six percent, overall, said that the tenants should be *different* from one another, 25 percent said they should be the same. This pattern was consistent for all three dimensions—age, race, income—across the

three income levels and the two study groups—MHFA tenants and the comparison groups.”

It is evident from this report that people of different backgrounds and economic conditions can live together harmoniously, in fact, with a much higher degree of satisfaction than is found in the traditional marketplace.

As a parting thought I would like to ask the reader to consider what it is that makes you satisfied or dissatisfied with your own housing. Do you like the town or city where you live? Is your neighborhood clean and attractive? Are the services good? Do you have the privacy you want? Are you disturbed by noise? Are your neighbors friendly? Nuisances? well-behaved?

Is the location convenient to your job? to shopping? to friends who wish to visit you? Are the surroundings a secure place for children to play? Is your housing a good value for what you pay? Is it soundly built and safe? Could you find better value elsewhere?

Are your neighbors richer or poorer than you?

GUN CONTROL

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there are few issues in this country today that are more emotional or less understood than the question of registration and control of firearms. Indeed, the issue is not just a matter of personal safety; it also is a matter of practicality and of constitutional rights.

Those who favor firearms registration and control often make the argument that if you get the guns off the street, there would be less crime. They also point out that many shooting incidents arise from family quarrels that are definitively settled by quick recourse to a gun. Finally, pro-gun-control advocates suggest that easy access to a gun increases the chance of an impulsive suicide.

Taken simply, or together, and supported by statistics that tell only one side of the story, these arguments can sound convincing especially when coupled with an explanation that the second amendment does not really give everyone the right to bear arms, because it was only meant to apply to those in the militia or, as some would like to believe, the National Guard.

I sympathize with those who would like to see crime reduced. Certainly, I would like to see it reduced also. But, we need to be reasonable and practical when we assess the causes of crime, not emotional. The fact of the matter is, guns do not kill people unless people pull the triggers any more than alcohol makes people alcoholics, unless people drink it, or drugs make people commit suicide unless someone takes an overdose. Ultimately, people, not society or some inanimate object that has been created, are responsible for what goes on in this world and it is they who should take the blame.

The irony of all this is that those arguing for gun control are often the very same ones that talk and complain loudest

about invasion of privacy, denial of liberty, or abridgement of free speech. Many who would deny that the Constitution does not really mean people have the right to keep and bear arms will argue to the bitter end that there should be absolutely no restriction on freedom of speech, even down to the right of the person to cry fire in a crowded theater. Worse yet, some of those making such claims do not see the inconsistency of their position any more than the fallacies of their other arguments or the holes in their logic.

Since this is the case, I would like to look at the arguments made in favor of gun control and try and replace some fiction with more facts and a bit of logic. First, let us take the argument that taking away everybody’s guns will reduce crime.

I will agree that if everybody’s guns were confiscated crime might go down, just as it would if all knives were confiscated. But, there are two problems. The first is the matter of getting “everybody” to turn in his gun. If criminals are willing to break the law by using a gun on someone else, they certainly are not going to turn it in—especially if they want to use it again. Even the Supreme Court ruled in 1968—*Haynes v. United States*, 390 U.S. 85—that people illegally possessing firearms could not be expected to turn them in, because that would violate their fifth amendment rights against self-incrimination. All gun control will mean is a bigger black market and, if people cannot protect themselves, an increase rather than a decrease in crime. Any streetwise person knows that the major deterrent to crime today is the fact many law-abiding people carry “heat” and “heat” is the great equalizer that even a criminal will respect. Take away from the law-abider his right to that protection and the criminals would have a heyday and our law-enforcement agencies would be so busy checking up on guns they would not have the time to do much about it. In short, gun controls would not only fail to reduce crime but, and this is the second problem, they are as impractical to enforce as prohibition. The logic that makes sense in this situation is not what you hear from the gun-control advocates, but what you see on the bumper sticker that reads: “If guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns.”

In support of this logic, let me cite some figures my distinguished colleague Steve Symms presented recently to the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime. Nationwide, there are over 20,000 firearms statutes in effect, yet the crime rate is still increasing. Hawaii, which has the lowest rate of gun ownership, has twice the crime rate of Wyoming, which has the highest rate of gun ownership. And in New York City, which has had a stiff gun registration and control law on the books for almost 50 years now, 21 percent of the Nation’s robberies are committed.

But perhaps the best projection of what would happen if gun control were adopted nationwide can be gleaned from the experience of Operation Pass in

Baltimore last fall. Operation Pass was a bounty program in which the city paid out \$50 to everyone who turned in a gun and \$100 for each tip leading to the confiscation of illegal firearms. By the time the program ended, the city had collected some 13,500 firearms and had spent over \$675,000 but, despite the expenditure, only an estimated 10 percent of the guns in the city were turned in. Moreover, in the first 2 weeks of the program, there were only 29 tips on illegal firearms despite the \$100 reward. And, to top it off, Baltimore's police commissioner was forced to admit that during the first 39 days of the program the number of gun related murders rose more than 50 percent. From a rate of one murder every 2 days involving a gun, the city suffered three gun murders every 4 days.

Such statistics hardly constitute evidence that guns will either be turned in voluntarily or that turning them in will do any good insofar as crime is concerned. However, the statistics do indicate that gun control is an expensive proposition and one that will not only take up time from other law enforcement efforts, but also badly needed money.

As a matter of fact, Government sponsored research done back in 1968 indicated that it would have cost \$72.87 to license each gun owner the way New York City does it. Now, with inflation, the cost would be over \$100 a gun owner, and with 40 million gun owners holding some 200 million guns, that would mean an initial cost of \$4 to \$5 billion to say nothing of keeping up the records. Only the Social Security System has to do a more thorough job of recordkeeping than gun registration and control would entail. Certainly we have better things to do with our money, particularly in these times, than to spend it depriving people of their right to protect themselves, invading their privacy, denying them the right to use a gun for hunting or target shooting and violating the second amendment of the Constitution.

Much has been made about the reference to the militia in the second amendment by proponents of gun control saying it negates the constitutional argument that everyone has the right to keep and bear arms. However, the militia should not be confused with the National Guard, which was not formed until the 20th century, and even now title 10, section 311 of the United States Code states that—

The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and . . . under 45 years of age who are or who have a declaration of intent to become citizens of the United States.

Since I doubt that anyone wants to discriminate against women or people over 45, particularly since a good case can be made for members of each group needing a gun for safety more than males between 17 and 45, it seems to me that there should be no question about everyone having the right to bear arms. Certainly our Founding Fathers meant it that way as they considered the right to bear arms essential to individual liberty.

In writing his draft of the Virginia Constitution, Thomas Jefferson stated:

No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms.

Similar expressions were forthcoming from men like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Samuel Adams. And, in 1790, George Washington said:

A free people ought not only to be armed and disciplined, and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to remind them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies.

Despite what some might think, such a doctrine was not new even then. In fact, the right to bear arms was rooted in 17th century English Common Law thus clearly indicating that the intent of the Founding Fathers was to make that right inviolate under any circumstances. As a matter of further fact, men like Adams and Henry went so far as to protest that the Constitution, as first submitted, did not guarantee "the right of having arms in your defense." The fact that, subsequently, the right to bear arms became the second right to be enumerated and adopted in the Bill of Rights suggests just how important a matter it was to those who were the architects of our freedom.

Another irony of this whole discussion is the fact that organized crime, an element that gun control supposedly attacks, stands to gain the most from it. Along with the numbers racket, gambling, protection and drugs, gun running and manufacture would become a major source of income. Guns are both cheap and easy to make and organized crime would soon be supplying them not only to criminals but to everyday people who, after noticing that the criminals do not give up their guns, decide they need one for their own protection. When it comes to their own lives, or the lives of their families, who is to say that people should not be able to acquire guns for protection. If one does not have that right, then all our rights are in danger.

Which brings me to a final point. Guns are a symbol of our freedom and our existence as a democratic society. In a system of checks and balances, they represent the ultimate check, the check of the people against abuses by their Government. If those words in the Declaration of Independence about the right to rebel against tyranny are to retain their meaning, we must safeguard the means to rebel even if we never expect to be exposed to tyranny again. When you get right down to it, the ultimate question at stake is liberty. Without doubt, guns are dangerous and, in the wrong hands, can hurt people, but to take guns out of all hands is not the answer. A much better solution lies in dealing directly with the gun-toting criminal. For his benefit, I have recommended legislation that would increase the penalty for using a firearm while committing a crime. To my way of thinking, putting the man who pulls the trigger in jail and keeping him there is a lot surer way of cutting down on crime than just doing away with some guns—more of which will always be available.

THE BLACK ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the economic situation continues to worsen, the plight of the poor becomes precarious. Unemployment in inner city communities far exceeds the national average. Youth and veterans, especially those who are black, cannot find jobs. Crime by men and women desperate for money to feed their families is on the rise since welfare and unemployment benefits do not keep up with the cost of living.

In conversations with many of the residents of the 19th Congressional District, I find growing despair over the failure of Congress to enact a full employment program which would guarantee a job for every American willing to work. The people's cynicism about the Federal Government's lack of concern and lack of action is also spreading.

The official statistics from the White House and the executive agencies minimize the breadth of our economic crisis. The impact of unemployment, inflation, and depression on the least visible members of our society—the poor, minorities, the aged—appears far less in the official reports than it is in reality. Perhaps the statisticians should spend more time in the field, talking with citizens, observing the true situation. The true figures may at least begin to push the White House and Congress into acting on pending legislation to finally deal forcefully with the crisis we face.

Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the Urban League, has written a perceptive article on the situation which appeared in the *Augusta, Ga., News-Review*:

THE BLACK ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

(By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.)

Statisticians have discovered a remarkable way to move people in and out of the labor force. They call it "seasonal adjustment". And one way to make the unemployment figures lower is not to count people as unemployed if they've given up looking for work in a job market where no employment opportunities exist.

The Labor Department's February unemployment figures showed a rate of 8.2 percent, or about 7.5 million people out of work. Those are seasonally adjusted figures, theoretical constructs to account for shifts in work patterns that occur from month to month.

But when real people are counted—bodies, not theoretical constructs—the picture changes somewhat. Then we have an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent and 8.3 million workers—real people with bills to pay and families to feed—out of work.

And even these figures are grossly misleading. In February, some 580,000 workers gave up looking for jobs. So long as they registered each week that they were actively looking for work, they were counted as unemployed. In February after weeks of fruitless job-hunting and no leads or interview possibilities they gave up the search. They thus became in the official statistics non-persons no longer part of the labor force and no longer counted as unemployed.

Seen from the vantage point of a person

who wants to work in a society that has no work for him, these statistical exercises become a sort of shell-game deceiving the public, legislators and the Administration about the seriousness of the Depression.

I'm not calling it a recession any more, because we are currently living through an economic Depression. For Black people, there isn't the faintest doubt about this.

One of the biggest barriers to getting the kind of federal action to end this Depression is the public's ignorance of the seriousness of the situation. The National Urban League's Research Department just released its quarterly economic report on the Black worker, and, along with up-dating to cover the last month or so, it presents a devastating picture of the Black economic Depression.

It estimates true Black unemployment including those out of work, working part-time when they want full-time work, and those who have given up trying to find jobs, at about 25 percent, one out of every four Black workers!

For Black teenagers, the official rate is over 40 percent. In some urban ghettos, up to half the people are without full-time jobs they want.

And that's not all. There are as many Blacks out of work today as in the darkest days of the Great Depression. About a quarter of the Black unemployed have been out of work for at least four months. About 700,000 of the Black unemployed are not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, because their unemployment did not result from direct job lay-offs, a requirement for such benefits.

And one striking finding is that Blacks, who comprise 12 percent of local government employees, make up almost half of all local government workers who were employed, offering striking testimony to the disproportionately lay-offs of Blacks by local governments, demonstrating lessened commitment to affirmative action.

Some people, noticing the concentration of Black workers in the laggard auto industry, think that alone accounts for high Black jobless rates. Not true. Far more Blacks have lost jobs in the construction and food processing industries.

And this Depression is not confined to Blacks, it cuts across the board. High white unemployment is also hidden by the official numbers game. In addition to the 6.9 million white workers officially counted as unemployed in February, add another 6.9 million discouraged workers, and people in part-time jobs who want full-time work and you've got a grand total of close to 14 million white people out of work today.

No amount of fudging can hide the fact that this nation is in a real Depression. It's time to stop haggling over what to call it and get to the business of ending it.

IS IT KISSINGER'S FAULT?

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, George F. Will may have a different view of our Secretary of State than I do, but his column "Is It Kissinger's Fault?" which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, April 18, 1975, contains a paragraph which states a truth all lovers of freedom and liberty should ponder. The paragraph says of Kissinger:

He knows that, strategically, time is not on the side of the bourgeois societies of the

West. Totalitarian regimes, for all their stupidities, have one strength—staying power. Open consumer societies, devoted to the manufacture and gratification of appetites, have no appetite for the disciplines and deferred gratifications that protracted international competition entails.

The full column follows:

IS IT KISSINGER'S FAULT?

(By George F. Will)

We are sliding into one of those tedious Washington debates that begin wrong and go downhill from there. The debate is about Henry Kissinger. To what extent is the state of the world—from Lisbon to Saigon—his fault?

It is another debate about a particular statesman, rather than the more troubling debate we should be having about the limits of democratic statecraft.

Kissinger's critics see him as the pilot in the following story:

A ship plying the coastal waters off Ireland picked up a pilot to guide the ship through the treacherously rocky waters. The ship's captain was appalled to learn that the pilot was drunk, but the pilot said: "Sir, I know every rock in these waters"—at which point there was the crash of hull hitting rock—"and, Glory be to God, there's one now."

Kissinger's critics tend to argue that if U.S. foreign policy is frustrated, some U.S. official must be to blame. This is unfair.

But Kissinger is partly to blame for the unreasonable expectations that he has raised and cannot fulfill. His direct, personal involvement in the short-run tactics as well as the long-run strategy of foreign policy encourages people to think that he expects his statecraft to subdue events.

For his own part, Kissinger feels like the 16th-century woman who was charged with witchcraft and was sentenced this way:

"The accused woman is to be thrown into the river—bound and gagged. If she sinks to the bottom and drowns, this will be proof of her innocence and she is to be given a proper burial; if she floats on the surface and breathes, this will be proof of her guilt, and she will be fetched immediately from the water and burned at the stake."

Kissinger has been criticized for an anti-institutional, over-personalized diplomatic style. And now that events beyond his control (beyond his congressionally diminished control) are unfolding unpleasantly, he is held personally responsible for them.

In fact, Kissinger's problems today are a web of paradoxes.

Political forces have their own physics: Kissinger's vanity has provoked a matching force from those he considers his tormentors, the insurgents in Congress. What Napoleon said of the French Revolution is true of Congress' revolution against Kissinger's domination of foreign policymaking: "Vanity made the Revolution; liberty was only a pretext."

Kissinger does not have humility in the face of Congress because, increasingly, he has humility in the face of history. Congress believes that when its members say "aye" to (say) a "model cities" program, model cities should result. Kissinger lives day-by-day with an even more turbulent world than the one which frustrates Congress' will for "model cities."

Kissinger is a strategic pessimist and a tactical optimist.

He knows that, strategically, time is not on the side of the bourgeois societies of the West. Totalitarian regimes, for all their stupidities, have one strength—staying power. Open consumer societies, devoted to the manufacture and gratification of appetites, have no appetite for the disciplines and deferred gratifications that protracted international competition entails.

But Kissinger, like a Confederate cavalry officer, believes that tactical daring in the short-run can partially compensate for the long-run weakness of a strategic position. This explains the fact that he is more ardent than discriminating in seeking agreements—pieces of paper.

The sobriety and pessimism of Kissinger's vision is, strictly speaking, unAmerican. It also is broadly correct: throughout history free societies have been short-lived rarities.

Kissinger's view also is, literally, unspeakable. No official of a democratic government can express such skepticism about the long-run toughness and wisdom of his society.

The gathering strength of the totalitarian movements substantiates Kissinger's unspoken strategic pessimism, but seems to contradict the tactical optimism that is his only permitted public posture. This poses the ultimate paradox:

The dangerousness of the world from Lisbon to Saigon, may produce the sobriety and cohesion without which no democratic nation can have a purposeful foreign policy. If you remember Lewis Carroll's poem "Hunting of the Snark" you know that nervousness has its uses:

But the valley grew narrow and narrower still,

And the evening got darker and colder,

Till (merely from nervousness, not from goodwill)

They marched along shoulder to shoulder.

SCHOOL SYSTEMS PUSH BLACKS OUT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, our children are told continually that a good education is a requirement for jobs, success, and advancement. They are told that a solid educational base is crucial and that the best way to get that foundation is to begin in the years of early childhood. The schools are supposed to put these principles into action, yet it is tragic that—on the contrary—many school systems seem to operate to prevent children from getting an education.

As the following article from the Greensboro, N.C., Carolina Peacemaker, makes clear, thousands of school systems deny educational opportunity to students by suspending or expelling them for imagined or real infractions. A disproportionate percentage of the victims of these practices are black children. Regardless of race or ethnic heritage, pupils who are suspended or pushed out are often discouraged from continuing their educations. Many will drop out permanently and then find no opportunities for jobs, especially in times like these. Worst of all is the fact that these discriminatory practices deny thousands of our children the chance to develop to the full limits their abilities, interests, and talents.

The Congressional Black Caucus will continue to fight for equal educational opportunity for all children and for an end to practices which deny those opportunities to youth.

The article follows:

SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS?—TWICE AS MANY BLACKS

WASHINGTON.—Black students are suspended from school at twice the rate of whites. That's the conclusion of a Health, Education and Welfare Department's survey of disciplinary actions during 1972-73, in 2,908 school systems across the country.

Black students, comprising 27 percent of the estimated 24 million students of all races at the 2,908 schools, accounted for 42 percent of all suspensions and 37 percent of all expulsions.

The report showed that 6 percent of the 6.5 million black students in the schools were suspended at least once, compared to 5 percent of the 9.1 million total for all

minorities and only 3 percent of the 14.8 million whites.

The HEW survey pointed out that blacks, as a result of the suspensions and expulsions, miss an average of 4.5 days of school, compared to an average of 4.3 days for all minorities, and only 3.5 days for whites.

In Maryland school systems, for example, blacks in Prince George's County make up 28 percent of the total enrollment, but 43 percent of total suspensions. In Montgomery County, it was just as bad—blacks total 7 percent of the student population, but 17 percent of those suspended.

In the Virginia school systems, Arlington County which has a 13 percent black student body accounted for 41 percent of black suspensions. And in Alexandria, where blacks

represented 37 percent of the total enrollment, the suspension rate was an unbelievable 64 percent.

The whole issue of suspensions, expulsions or "push-outs" has sparked serious debate among civil rights organizations.

At the helm is the NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund, which has filed suit against the Prince George's County School system, alleging that the extremely harsh suspensions are depriving the black students of their educational rights.

The Supreme Court ruled in January, 1975, that students facing temporary suspension from public school have property and liberty rights and must be accorded due process in disciplinary cases.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 22, 1975

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of creation and love, as the miracle of springtime covers the Earth with a tapestry of beauty, show us that history has its resurrections, that springtime follows winter, day follows night and out of travail comes the birth of better days. In these dismal days when most news is bad news, save us from a cynical pessimism by the radiant belief that this time of sorrow is not the end of history but the time to assess enduring values. May no disappointment lead to despair, no failure extinguish the bright light of hope. Equip us for the role we must play in the making of a better world. Thus in this Chamber may the words of our mouths, the thoughts of our minds, the emotions of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1975.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FORD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 21, 1975, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF MONEYS DERIVED FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF OIL SHALE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 82.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 834) to provide that moneys due the States under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, derived from the development of oil shale resources, may be used for purposes other than public roads and schools.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 2, in line 6, following the word "development" strike the word "of" and insert the word "or" so to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 35 of the Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 450), as amended (30 U.S.C. 191), is further amended by striking the period at the end of the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the language as follows: "And provided further, That all moneys paid to any State on or after January 1, 1974, from sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals of public lands for the purpose of development of or research concerning oil shale deposits may be used by such State and its subdivisions for (1) planning, (2) construction and maintenance of public facilities, and (3) provision of public services, as the legislature of the State may direct giving priority to those subdivisions of the State socially or economically impacted by the development or research activities."

The amendment was agreed to.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE 15TH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the Easter recess—specifically, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday—representatives of the U.S. Congress participated in the

15th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, held March 26-31, in Campeche, Mexico.

A report on the conference is being released today.

As chairman of the Senate delegation, I want to draw special attention to this year's report and the work of the Conference. I ask that this matter be given special consideration not because the Conference produced any Earth-shaking results or any news of cataclysmic proportions. Indeed, the participants in the Conference did not "blast" anyone. They did not vehemently "denounce" anything; and, so far as I am aware, no one so much as "stalked" out of a meeting. In view of this, I suppose that by our press standards, the Conference was a "bust" in terms of its newsworthiness.

I strongly believe, nevertheless, that the work of the Conference deserves the public's attention:

Its accomplishments include increased goodwill between Mexico and the United States;

Its accomplishments include increased understanding of problems of mutual concern; and

Its accomplishments include increased friendship and trust between the people of our two countries.

I regret that accomplishments such as these are less newsworthy than the tragic events which fill our daily newspapers.

The United States is indeed fortunate to have a friend and neighbor like Mexico. The truth of the matter is that we could not hope for a better friend or a better neighbor.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Senate delegation on the 15th meeting of the U.S. Interparliamentary Group, held at Campeche, Mexico, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP—REPORT OF THE SENATE DELEGATION ON THE FIFTEENTH MEETING, HELD AT CAMPECHE, MEXICO

(By Senator Mike Mansfield, Chairman)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

APRIL 18, 1975.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. VICE PRESIDENT: In accordance with Public Law 86-420, approved April 9, 1960, I am transmitting herewith a report on the 15th meeting of the Mexico-United